

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1932

(Legislative day of Thursday, December 8, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, transmitted to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. DANIEL E. GARRETT, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3532) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to readjust and close streets, roads, highways, or alleys in the District of Columbia rendered useless or unnecessary, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Costigan	Hull	Reynolds
Austin	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Bailey	Cutting	Kean	Robinson, Ind.
Bankhead	Dale	Kendrick	Schuyler
Barkley	Davis	Keyes	Sheppard
Bingham	Dickinson	King	Shipstead
Black	Dill	La Follette	Smoot
Blaine	Fess	Logan	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	Long	Swanson
Bratton	George	McGill	Townsend
Broussard	Glass	McKellar	Trammell
Bulkley	Glenn	McNary	Tydings
Bulow	Gore	Metcalf	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Grammer	Moses	Wagner
Capper	Hale	Neely	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Carey	Hastings	Nye	Watson
Cohen	Hatfield	Oddie	White
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	
Coolidge	Hayden	Pittman	
Copeland	Howell	Reed	

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] is detained by illness.

Mr. BYRNES. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is detained in attendance upon the funeral of a relative.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business.

I also wish to announce that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] is detained by reason of illness.

Mr. METCALF. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HEBERT] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] is necessarily absent by reason of illness.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is necessarily detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Broadway Association, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the taking of preliminary legislative steps during the present session of Congress to repeal the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution, the passage of legislation looking to an equitable modification of the so-called Volstead Act, and the with-

holding of further appropriations for enforcement of the Volstead Act during the period of time covering the final disposition of the proposed repeal of the eighteenth amendment, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a memorial from members of Post No. 35, Workers Ex-service Mens' League, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against "police persecution of veterans in Washington," which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of a committee representing the Rank and File Veterans and other veterans groups assembled at Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of legislation providing immediate cash payment of the so-called soldiers' bonus and other relief and protesting against the deportation of bonus marchers from the District of Columbia on July 28, 1932, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. CARAWAY presented memorials numerously signed by sundry citizens of Gurdon, Magazine, Fort Smith, Gentry, Batesville, Winslow, Nettleton, Fordyce, Carlisle, Conway, Evening Shade, Malvern, Stephens, Prescott, Paragould, Greenwood, Harrison, Newport, Forrest City, Monticello, Jonesboro, and other cities in Arkansas, and of citizens of Rialto, Calif., remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the modification of the so-called Volstead Act so as to increase the alcoholic content of permissible beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana presented memorials of 162 citizens of Selma, Muncie, Daleville, and Middletown, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the modification or repeal of the so-called Volstead law, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of Elbow Lake and vicinity, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the passage of legislation known as the Frazier farm relief bill, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the passage of legislation providing supervision and regulation of the motion-picture industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BINGHAM presented resolutions adopted by Harry W. Congdon Post, No. 11, American Legion, of Bridgeport, Conn., opposing the movement to curtail benefits pertaining to World War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the sixty-fifth annual meeting of the Litchfield Northwest Association of Congregational Churches and Ministers, at Falls Village, Conn., favoring the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, and expressing its interest in and hope for the success of the deliberations of the disarmament conference at Geneva, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of the Woman's Home Mission Auxiliary and friends, of the town of Woodbury, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation providing supervision and regulation of the motion-picture industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of members of the Church and Bible School of the Baptist Church of Niantic; the Christian Endeavor Society of the Federated Church of Bloomfield, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Bloomfield and Saybrook, all in the State of Connecticut, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hawaii, of Honolulu, Hawaii, remonstrating against repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution and the repeal or modification of the so-called Volstead Act relative to the

manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COPELAND presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clinton, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of legislation legalizing the manufacture and sale of liquors with alcoholic content stronger than one-half of 1 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of sundry citizens (librarians) of New York City, N. Y., praying that payment of the foreign war debts be postponed with a view to their reduction, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented telegrams from Lewis Henry, of Elmira, and Orville C. Sanborn, of New York City in the State of New York, commending the opposing attitude of Mr. COPELAND in relation to the pending so-called Hawes-Cutting Philippine independence bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Endicott, the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wellsville, and the Woman's Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Katonah, all in the State of New York, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Katonah, and the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wellsville, both in the State of New York, praying for the passage of legislation providing supervision and regulation of the motion-picture industry, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Syracuse and Binghamton, N. Y., remonstrating against ratification of the treaty known as the St. Lawrence seaway treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the boards of directors of the New York Development Association, the Retail Merchants Association, and the chamber of commerce, all of Ogdensburg; and the boards of supervisors of Franklin and St. Lawrence Counties, all in the State of New York, favoring the ratification of the treaty known as the St. Lawrence seaway treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALCOTT presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Lieut. C. C. Robinson Post, No. 254, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of House bill 4633, the so-called widows and orphans pension bill, and also the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates of ex-service men (bonus), which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials and papers in the nature of memorials of the Yalesville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Yalesville; the Westville Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of New Haven; the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, of Scotland; the East Lyme Congregational Church, of Niantic, and sundry citizens of South Manchester and Manchester, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the so-called Volstead Act, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions and papers in the nature of petitions of Tomalonis-Hall Unit, No. 84, of Simsbury; Tuttle-Burns Unit, No. 43, of Winsted; Torrington Post, No. 38, of Torrington; Horace J. Tanguay Unit, No. 80, of Thompsonville; Milardo-Wilcox Unit, No. 75, of Middletown; Kiltonic Post, No. 72, of Southington; and the second district, all of the American Legion Auxiliary, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of House bill 4633, the so-called widows and orphans pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented the petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Cambridge, Mass., praying for the passage of legislation providing supervision and regulation of

the motion-picture industry, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Home Missionary Society and the Epworth League of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Newton and the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Cambridge, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of employees of the Revere and Malden (Mass.) post offices, remonstrating against adoption of a wage cut and furlough plan for postal employees as proposed by the President in a recent message to the Congress, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I present and ask to have published in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter I received from the Foreign Commerce Club of Boston, Mass., stating in detail its opposition to the ratification of the treaty between the United States and Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, December 8, 1932.

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate for the purpose of ratifying the treaty already signed by the United States and Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterways have been held for the past few weeks, and there has been a strong protest filed against this treaty by many organizations and individuals.

The Foreign Commerce Club of Boston (Inc.) has gone on record against this proposition, and sets forth the following reasons for its action:

First. The actual cost of construction has been variously estimated between \$580,000,000 and \$1,000,000,000. No one can correctly estimate this cost. The cost of maintenance after the work is completed is absolute guesswork and has been estimated around \$40,000,000 per annum.

Second. Especially at the present time when the financial condition of the country is in such a deplorable state, when economy is the watchword, and when the President is preaching economy and the cutting of appropriations, it would be a worthless waste.

Third. The cost, whatever it will be, will be a direct tax on the taxpayers of the country, whereas only a small section of the country will benefit—if there will be such a thing as benefit.

Fourth. The statement has been made that this so-called benefit will accrue to western and midwestern shippers who ship their goods—such as grain, etc.—to foreign countries at a rate much lower than the railroads' tariff to tidewater. In the same breath, knowing this will be competition against the railroads, the cry comes that the railroads must be protected, and, if possible, reconstructed under Government supervision, as many have passed their dividends and defaulted interest on their bonds. There is no consistency in this, and it is economically unjust to encourage such competition against the railroads.

Fifth. In the case of grain and provisions shipped from Central United States to foreign countries direct, the Atlantic seaboard ports would lose all this business they have enjoyed for years, as the merchandise will be shipped direct.

Sixth. There are no present or future prospects for the export grain business on account of the preferential English tariff. Therefore, only Canadian grain will be exported, in which case Canada only will benefit at the expense of the United States.

Seventh. Railroads of the United States have invested millions of dollars in grain elevators in Boston and other ports, and should the present practical embargo in American grain be lifted no storage in transit for export grain will be shipped to tidewater, thus the elevators will be practically scrapped.

Eighth. The St. Lawrence is frozen over and, therefore, un-navigable for nearly half the year, and an investment by the United States for the construction of the waterways would, therefore, be for a half-year service.

Ninth. No vessels over 24 feet draft will be able to navigate to the end of the Great Lakes, and it is stated that insurance rates will increase on account of the added jeopardy.

Tenth. The waterways will be in Canadian territory principally, and we are called on to carry the burden of the expense with no plan for the return of a cent to either country.

Eleventh. One would understand from the propaganda for the approval of the project that the State of New York would be greatly benefited. There is a tremendous opposition from this State, mostly from Buffalo, Albany, and New York City, each city feeling their foreign trade will be at stake—and rightfully so.



Twelfth. The whole project appears to be indorsed by the power interests, who will be the sole beneficiaries. Even Mr. Henry I. Harriman, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, made a public statement that the only beneficiaries of power will be central and northern New York.

Thirteenth. If the project is to help the power companies to the detriment of shipping interests, then it would be best for us to keep out of it.

Fourteenth. The State of New York has many natural sources for water power. This being the case, why does not the State of New York develop this water power and assess the users sufficient to pay for it in a certain period of time? Bonds could be issued for this purpose to be retired by tolls from the power companies.

Fifteenth. The whole project appears to be sanctioned by eminent engineers whose whole lives are imbued with a self-satisfied feeling of greatness of such gigantic feats. The whole project is wrong, and should be defeated by the Senate as a whole in the event that the Foreign Relations Committee recommend that the treaty be ratified.

At the request of the Foreign Commerce Club of Boston (Inc.), I ask that you use your influence in the nonratification of this treaty.

Respectfully,

WALTER E. DOHERTY,

President Foreign Commerce Club of Boston (Inc.).

#### THE WORLD COURT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present a petition from leading Republicans throughout the country to Republican Senators asking for action on the World Court during the present short session. I request that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*To the Republican Members of the United States Senate:*

We respectfully urge the exercise of your influence on behalf of settlement of the World Court issue at the present short session.

The Republican platform of 1932, declaring "America should join its influence and gain a voice in this institution," implies, in our judgment, the Senate's prompt consent to ratification of the pending protocols.

Even if the Republican platform were not thus explicit, it would be clear that a question that has been before the country and the Senate for so many years is now entitled to settlement, one way or another, upon the merits. It is 10 years since the court proposal was first sent to the Senate. It is 33 years since the United States, at the first Hague conference in 1899, first proposed a court of international justice.

The court proposed by us in 1899, and again at the second Hague conference in 1907, was in essential respects like the existing court, "an agency," as Secretary Stimson has pointed out, "more closely in line with the traditions and habit of thought of America than of any other nation." If the United States is seriously interested in indorsing the principle of judicial settlement, where it is applicable, we can not logically withhold adherence to the statute of the present court. Mr. Hughes, now Chief Justice, pointed out in 1929:

"So far as we can see into the future, there will be but one court—the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. It is supported by about 50 states. It has performed its function successfully, with a gratifying degree of confidence reposed in it, as is shown by the increasing volume of its work. It is idle to suppose that any other permanent court could be established."

The court measures are already legislatively advanced. The question facing us is no longer the primary general question whether the United States should adhere to the court. That question was answered by the Senate resolution of 1926, providing that the United States should adhere on certain conditions. The present question before the Senate is whether the pending protocols meet these conditions.

The Department of State, after a careful study, announced in 1929, through Secretary Stimson, that the pending protocols entirely meet the 1926 reservations; and the Secretary repeated and expanded this conclusion to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate last spring:

"The longer I have reflected upon these protocols the more clear I am that not only have the conditions originally imposed by the Senate reservations been fully met but that additional machinery has been provided for preliminary negotiations which greatly enhances the efficacy of the reservations themselves."

The court, by its statute and by the terms of the protocols now proposed, is restrained from giving either a judgment or an advisory opinion in any dispute that concerns us without the explicit consent of the United States. The position of the United States is fully protected.

Action upon the court measures has in previous sessions been deferred on the ground that pressing domestic legislation of an economic nature made it impracticable to take the time for considering the court treaties. Urgent questions confront the short session also, questions deriving both from the troubled situation at home and from the troubled situation abroad. Far from constituting a reason for again deferring action, the present troubled condition of the world points imperatively to the need for clear

indorsement of the stabilizing principle of judicial settlement of those disputes which will continually arise between nations, the more frequently as their economic interrelations become the more complex.

We urge that the delay on the court measures now be terminated and that, in accord with the spirit of the 1932 Republican platform, the question of ratifying the three pending protocols be expedited on the calendar of the short session, in order that the record vote may be reached before the fixed date of adjournment on March 4.

The signers of the Republican appeal:

Gen. James Guthrie Harbord, New York City; Harry Chandler, Los Angeles, publisher of the Los Angeles Times; Robert Lincoln O'Brien, Boston, publisher of the Boston Herald, chairman United States Tariff Commission; Charles D. Hilles, New York City, Republican national committeeman for New York State; William Cooper Procter, Cincinnati, president Procter & Gamble Co.; Henry D. Sharpe, Providence, president Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co.; Sewell Avery, Chicago, president Montgomery Ward & Co.; William M. Maltbie, Hartford, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut; Nathan William MacChesney, Chicago, former president Illinois State Bar Association, vice president American Bar Association, judge advocate, general headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces, France, General Pershing's staff, 1918-19; Jay N. Darling, Des Moines, Iowa, member of the platform committee of the 1932 Republican National Convention; C. B. Merriam, Topeka, Kans., vice president Central Trust Co.; Henry M. Butzel, Detroit, justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan; Frederick S. Chase, Waterbury, Conn., president Chase Brass & Copper Co.; W. C. Kincaid, Cheyenne, member of the platform committee of the 1932 Republican National Convention; Llewellyn L. Callaway, Helena, Mont., chief justice of the Supreme Court of Montana; Charles F. Scott, Iola, Kans., member of the platform committee of the 1932 Republican Convention, former Congressman; Paul Shoup, San Francisco, vice chairman Southern Pacific Railroad; C. A. McCloud, York, Nebr., Republican national committeeman for Nebraska; Homer P. Clark, St. Paul, vice chairman of the board, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, chairman West Publishing Co.; Lester D. Summerfield, Reno, attorney; Fred A. Howland, Montpelier, Vt., president National Life Insurance Co.; Frederick L. Perry, New Haven, attorney; Frank G. Leslie, Minneapolis; Frank T. Post, Spokane, Wash., vice president and general counsel Washington Water Power Co., former president Washington State Bar Association; John G. Sargent, Ludlow, Vt., former Attorney General of the United States; Charles Hebbard, Spokane, Wash., former chairman Washington State Republican committee; John R. McLane, Manchester, N. H., chairman New Hampshire State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation; Charles Elmquist, St. Paul, attorney; Percival P. Baxter, Portland, Me., former Governor of Maine; Samuel Platt, Reno, member of the platform committee of the 1932 Republican National Convention; William B. Harrison, Louisville, mayor of Louisville; George F. Booth, Worcester, Mass., publisher Worcester Telegram and Evening Gazette, former president New England Newspaper Alliance; Louis K. Liggett, Boston, former National Republican committeeman for Massachusetts, president United Drug Co.; Silas H. Strawn, Chicago, former president American Bar Association, former president United States Chamber of Commerce; William H. Crocker, San Francisco, president Crocker First National Bank, Republican national committeeman for California, 1916-1932; Henry I. Harriman, Boston, president Chamber of Commerce of the United States, chairman board of trustees Boston Elevated Railway, vice chairman board of directors New England Power Association; William G. Mather, Cleveland, vice president Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., chairman of the board Otis Steel Co.; Howard J. Heinz, Pittsburgh, president H. J. Heinz Co.; William J. Donovan, Buffalo, assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, colonel of the One hundred and sixty-fifth Infantry during the war; Mrs. Worthington Scranton, Scranton, Pa., Republican national committeewoman for Pennsylvania; Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Pasadena, director Norman Bridge Laboratory of Physics, California Institute of Technology; James B. Forgan, Jr., Chicago, vice president First National Bank of Chicago; Edgar H. Evans, Indianapolis, president Acme-Evans (milling) Co., former president Millers' National Federation; Gardner Cowles, Des Moines, Iowa, publisher of the Des Moines Register Tribune, member Reconstruction Finance Corporation; George Henderson, Cumberland, Md., mayor of Cumberland; John Crosby, Minneapolis, Washburn Crosby Co.; Russell M. Bennett, Minneapolis; Frank G. Allen, Boston, former Governor of Massachusetts; Allyn L. Brown, Norwich, Conn., senior judge of the Superior Court of Connecticut; Ralph E. Williams, Portland, Oreg., vice chairman Republican National Committee; Samuel R. McKelvie, Lincoln, Nebr., former Governor of Nebraska, member of the platform committee of the 1932 Republican National Convention,

publisher of the Nebraska Farmer; Robert Smith, Omaha, Nebr., chairman Republican State committee of Nebraska; Milton C. Lightner, St. Paul, member of the State senate for the fortieth district of Minnesota; Isaac M. Meekins, Elizabeth City, N. C., judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, former chairman of the Republican State committee; George C. Baker, Morgantown, W. Va.; John M. Crawford, Parkersburg, W. Va.; Walter J. Harris, Reno, banker; H. C. Ogden, Wheeling, W. Va., publisher of the Wheeling Intelligencer and other West Virginia newspapers; E. G. Larson, Valley City, N. Dak., treasurer and manager Agricultural Credit Co. of Valley City; William A. Cant, Duluth, judge of the United States district court, Minnesota; R. A. Nestos, Minot, N. Dak., member of the platform committee of the 1932 Republican National Convention, former Governor of North Dakota; Wirt Franklin, Ardmore, Okla., president Wirt Franklin Petroleum Corporation; Henry F. Lippitt, Providence, former United States Senator from Rhode Island; Edward Duffield, Princeton, N. J., president Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America; E. T. Weir, Pittsburgh, chairman National Steel Corporation; Gov. William Tudor Gardiner, of Maine.

#### THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT AND THE VOLSTEAD ACT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Broadway Association of New York City, a very prominent organization, which has been transmitted to me by its president, also one of our leading citizens, Dr. John A. Harriss.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas important matters relating to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and modification of the Volstead Act are now pending before Congress; and

Whereas prompt and sound action by Congress is seriously urgent in the matters mentioned in order that confidence and better business may be restored; and

Whereas immediate action by Congress in passing a resolution for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment is of vital national importance during this unprecedented depression; and

Whereas because of the convening of the respective legislatures of certain States of the Union within one month, at which ratification of the amendment for repeal may be given; and

Whereas it will be two years before some of these respective legislatures convene again: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Broadway Association of New York City respectfully requests that the Senate of the United States through its properly constituted committee take immediate constructive action during its present session as follows:

First. The legislative preliminary steps to repeal the eighteenth amendment.

Second. Pass the necessary legislation looking to an equitable modification of the Volstead Act.

Third. Initiate a bill that Congress withhold further appropriations for enforcement of the Volstead Act during the period of time covering the final disposition of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

JOHN A. HARRISS, President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., December 12, 1932.

#### FARM RELIEF

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask leave to print in the RECORD an address made by Mr. Frederick E. Murphy, publisher of the Minneapolis Tribune, before the Academy of Political Science in New York. Mr. Murphy publishes the leading daily newspaper of the Northwest in support of the farmer and has for years lent his help in behalf of legislation that will restore agriculture to equality with industry. I ask that this speech be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In seeking a formula for our national recovery we must also look for a special formula for our agricultural recovery. Our agricultural problem is a special problem within our national problem. It is complicated to a bewildering degree. It is made up of almost numberless contradictory factors which seem to defy all our efforts to align them into anything like a practical theory.

Yet our agricultural problem, with all its manifold difficulties, is one that we must face courageously and intelligently. We must come to grips with its many and refractory facts and somehow we must find an answer.

Those who have watched the economic progress of the Nation are well aware of the fact that America had an agricultural depres-

sion before it experienced this world-wide depression. We know that since 1920, with but few and temporary exceptions, the exchange value of the products of agriculture gradually has been sinking lower and lower. When stocks were at their highest price in the New York Stock Exchange, when factories were operating day and night with constantly increasing wage scales, when professional services were at their greatest demand, and the economic millenium seemed to have arrived, with mass production, mass consumption, and higher and higher wages, we know that the general price level of agricultural products was declining. We know that farm mortgages were being foreclosed, that banks were failing in the agricultural districts.

We are forced to the conclusion that for a period of a few years at least the majority of those who make up this Nation may revel in the benefits of prosperity while 25 per cent of its people on the farms are sinking to distress levels. This actually happened in the period preceding the nation-wide depression.

#### PROSPERITY FOR 10 YEARS WITH FARMER LEFT OUT

We may look back on that period of expansion with scorn and contempt. We may assert that it was false prosperity in that it was doomed by its inherent falseness—failure to find its way into the lives of the 30,000,000 of our people who are on the farms—to come to a disastrous end. But there is no denying the fact that for 10 years preceding 1929 the people of the United States, with the exception of the farmers, had more of the good things of life than they ever had had before.

We are justified in doubting that this condition could have long continued. But it is also equally questionable whether the low estate of agriculture had any important part in bringing to an end this era of all but forgotten prosperity. It might have gone on indefinitely, with agriculture sinking to lower levels, until the American farmer became a peasant.

I am by no means convinced that such a development is economically possible. I am quite certain that it is not politically possible. And I am absolutely certain that it is ethically wrong. I do not believe that the United States, with a population of 120,000,000, can exist as a nation with 30,000,000 of its people economically submerged, so long as they have political power in proportion to their numbers.

No matter what we may think of agriculture, from the social or political viewpoint, we are compelled to recognize economic facts, and that these facts are under no obligation to be pleasant. Facts seldom take the trouble to flatter us.

Let us look at the facts.

First of all, we must recognize that the exchange value of agricultural products the world over is declining. There may be many reasons for this. The world is becoming more and more productive. It produces more and more food, and the mechanization of industry has decreased the per capita requirements for food. The pick and the shovel, the scythe, the hoe, the fork, and the sledge hammer have disappeared; and power instruments have come to take their places. Even the home has become mechanized.

The horse has disappeared from the city; and the acres of farm lands that were once devoted to producing the oats and hay that furnished the power for city trucking and hauling as well as farm work are now—by the use of gasoline—thrown back to produce more food.

#### WORLD'S PRODUCTION OF FOOD INCREASES

Coincident with this decreased demand has come a rapid increase in world production of food. In the last 40 years the world production of wheat has doubled. That of the United States has increased from 378,000,000 to 892,000,000 bushels; that of Canada from 42,000,000 to 304,000,000 bushels; that of India from 229,000,000 to 347,000,000 bushels; that of Argentina from 31,000,000 to 219,000,000 bushels; that of Australia from 27,000,000 to 171,000,000 bushels; and so the story of increased food production goes.

Medical and sanitary science have made the Tropics habitable for the white race to supervise and develop tropical production of substitutes for old foods and new foods. The Tropics have thus been brought into ruinous competition with the farmer in the temperate zone.

Scientific development makes it possible to carry products from season to season and year to year; also from State to State and from country to country.

One has but to observe the increased use of such a product as coconut oil, and you will realize the change that has taken place. The average importation of coconut oil, 1921 to 1925, was 392,000,000 pounds, which had increased in 1930 to 655,000,000 pounds. The average of palm and palm-kernel oil, 1921 to 1925, was 89,000,000 pounds, for 1930 it was 250,000,000 pounds. And while we are importing these oils, the American farmer is forced to export a billion pounds of animal fats each year. In 1924 the United States was exporting more oils, oil materials, animal and vegetable fats than we were importing. But in 1929 our imports exceeded our exports by approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds. This, of course, is what is driving the dairy, hog, and cattle producers into a frenzy. The increase in world production from 1923 to 1929 amounted to 5,000,000,000 pounds.

Coconut oil has fallen in price from 18.1 cents in 1918, to 4.5 cents in 1931. During the same period cottonseed oil has fallen from 24.1 cents to 7.2 cents; tallow from 17.9 cents to 4.3 cents. Other vegetable and animal oils and fats have shown the same decline.

The world production of vegetable oils in 1929 was not far from 20,000,000,000 pounds, or ten times the butter production in



the United States. The American farmer not only has to compete with the Tropics but with the ocean as well. In 1931 the world production of marine animal oils is estimated at 1,750,000,000 pounds. Of this nearly 1,500,000,000 pounds was whale oil. Whale oil is now used for the making of butter substitutes in Europe, and to a small extent in the United States, otherwise it chiefly goes into soap making.

The American farmer thus finds himself in desperate competition with the fecundity of the Tropics and the teeming animal life of the ocean, while he struggles with the less-bountiful soil along the forty-fifth parallel of latitude.

#### TRANSPORTATION HANDICAP FOR AMERICAN FARMER

The American farmer also finds himself at a grave disadvantage in the matter of transportation. A large percentage of the American industrial and commercial population lives on or near the seaboard, and is more accessible to foreign markets for food materials and industrial raw materials than he is to the center of American agriculture. A very large proportion of American agricultural products come from the Central States, which average a thousand miles from seaboard, in contrast to Argentina, Australia, and other countries, where most agricultural products are produced relatively close to tidewater. Ocean rates are extraordinarily low. In contrast to these low water rates are the excessively high domestic railroad rates which must be paid on the mass of agricultural products from the farms of the Mississippi Valley. Flax is grown a few hundred miles from the seaboard in Argentina and laid down at the port of New York at a price which the North Dakota flax grower can never hope to meet. New Zealand sells butter in San Francisco.

These facts can not be lightly dismissed with the reflection that the United States is predominantly an industrial nation. The farmers can not be carried along by the highly paid factory workers, for the simple reason that there are too many farmers. In the Annalist of August 12, 1932, was published an analysis of the occupational census of 1930. Out of a total of 48,830,000 gainfully employed persons in the United States, there were 14,111,000 in the mechanical and manufacturing industries. These figures include the proprietors and executive officials, the building and printing trades, and a variety of occupations outside the factory in which men generally work for themselves.

In agriculture there were 10,472,000 persons employed. The 14,000,000 industrial workers can not hope to carry the 10,000,000 agricultural workers. This enumeration of the agricultural workers does not take into consideration the millions of others who are dependent directly or indirectly on the farm group. Economic equilibrium demands that the farmer must be able to exchange his products for a fair share of the products of industry. This exchange he has not been able to make for over a decade.

The farmer can not be viewed as a mere dependent upon industry. In the American economic set-up the farmer must be viewed as a consumer as well as a producer. So any theory of mass production and mass sales and high industrial wages which does not include a high exchange value for the farmer's products must inevitably produce economic disequilibrium.

#### INDUSTRY MUST HELP FARMER AS CONSUMER

Industry can not evade the difficulties that confront the American farmer by the bland theory of subsistence farming. Subsistence farming is but a euphemism for peasantry. The peasant farmer is not and can not be a consumer of industrial products, and farming reduced to a mere mode of life has no place in America. Industry can not afford to ignore the buying power of 30,000,000 of our 120,000,000 people. Industry can not exist solely on the buying power of industrial workers; therefore, for the purely selfish reason of self-preservation, industry must assume direct responsibility of returning the farmer to his proper rôle of a consumer.

We must face the fact that here in America we have nearly a billion acres of arable land, divided into some 6,000,000 farms, on the products of which depend one-fourth of our population. We must face the fact that these billion acres can not continue to produce food for human consumption at a profit to the American farmer.

Some agricultural economists and well-thinking business men decree that the agricultural plant must be reduced by segregating marginal areas, withdrawing them from production until the future demands that they be reopened. This plan holds an appeal for me, but knowing regional prides and political expediencies as I do, I rather favor charging industry with finding some method by which these marginal acres can be profitably employed for purposes other than the production of food. If 50,000,000 acres of our food-producing acres could be diverted to the production of raw materials, such as wallboard, newsprint, etc., for industrial purposes, our surplus problem would be more relatively simple. I believe it can be accomplished if industry seriously attempts it.

I realize that it is much easier to state the problem than to solve it, but I feel the necessity of stating it because industry does not appear to realize that the problem exists.

#### METROPOLITAN PRESS LARGELY IGNORES PROBLEM

I presume that my own profession—journalism—is as much to blame for this indifference as any other. Our eastern newspapers pay great attention to the other details of our economic life—shipping, financing, manufacturing, mining—while little or no thought is given to agriculture. What thought is given to agriculture is a reflection of the attention paid to farm politicians in Washington. Your Washington correspondent has the political viewpoint rather than the economic, and most of his contacts with

the farm problem are through men who will be retired to private life when it is solved. When our metropolitan newspapers realize, as they must some day, the national importance of the economic phases of this Nation's farm problem, we will begin to see the light. The best brains of the country will be loaned to agriculture, not because of altruism, but because industry will understand that they must help develop its sales market as well as exploit it.

The American market is, and apparently for a long time to come must be, the principal market for the American farmer, with the exception of the cotton and tobacco grower. We consume over 99 per cent of our beef and veal and mutton and lamb, over 96 per cent of our pork, 99 per cent of our oats, 99 per cent of our rye, 99 per cent of our corn, 92 per cent of our oranges, 84 per cent of our apples, 99 per cent of our potatoes, 99 per cent of our peanuts, 98 per cent of our beans, and 100 per cent of our flax and hay.

As against this domestic consumption we export about 55 per cent of our cotton, 41 per cent of our tobacco, 18.5 per cent of our wheat, and 33 per cent of our lard. Our exports of lard are forced on us largely because of our importation of tropical fats and oils which are used as substitutes for the animal fats produced on our farms.

No consideration of the part that agricultural prosperity must play in the restoration of general prosperity can be complete without a consideration of the world trends that had their inception in the World War. Before the war came to an end, Europe was bankrupt. Practically every European nation became a debtor nation. The net result of Europe's postwar condition was a determination to become economically self-sufficient. Europe went further and further into debt. Now being in debt, it has to sell and can not buy. Almost without exception European nations have surrounded themselves by high tariff walls.

#### TARIFF BARRIERS HALT INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Tariff battles are being fought on every frontier. These tariff walls constitute a blockade that is almost as effective as that maintained by the British Navy in the North Sea. International trade is stopped, and with its stoppage comes the curtailment of domestic production, which in turn curtails domestic consumption, and one of the effects of this curtailment in domestic consumption is that farm products are going begging for any price in the United States to-day.

Intergovernmental debts are at the bottom of the difficulty, and the fundamental cause for the stoppage of international trade. Intergovernmental debts have forced all the debtor nations on a buyer's strike. The debtor nation obviously must sell more than it buys. The tariff is the device by which debtor nations seek to gain a favorable balance of trade in order to meet their debt requirements. When every nation refuses to buy and strives only to sell, we have an economic stalemate, reminiscent of trench warfare.

And thus it comes about that the products of the American farm are being sold in diminishing quantities in Europe, and at prices which will not sustain the American farmer.

European nations are to-day taxing their people heavily to this end. Germany has a duty of \$1.87 on wheat, France 84½ cents, Italy \$1.23, Austria 64 cents, Czechoslovakia 97½ cents, Poland \$1.76, and the limit of absurdity is found in Greece, with a tariff duty on wheat of \$7.99 a bushel. Europe, with its high import duties on food, is forcing the growth of its own agriculture by keeping out the products of the great food-exporting countries.

#### EUROPE PEACE WOULD AID UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE

The fear of another war undoubtedly plays a part in this determination of Europe to attain a food self-sufficiency. And thus in this complex world it has come about that intergovernmental debts; the nationalistic suspicions of Europe; nationalism, that in many cases is based only on a vernacular, have a pronounced effect on the welfare of Dakota and Nebraska farmers. It has thus come about that the lack of peace and good will among men in far-distant lands means dollars and cents to the hog raiser of Iowa.

It follows inevitably that the removal of these causes for suspicion and hatred will redound to the benefit of the American farmer. Unless the United States adopts a policy of isolation, which includes a system of bounties sufficient to insure the American farmer a fair exchange basis for his products, the American farmer must look to the prosperity, peace, and confidence of Europe for any immediate benefit to agriculture. So long as the nations of Europe live in fear of another war, so long will they continue to force their own agriculture, by uneconomic means, by the exclusion of foodstuffs from the western continent. So long as vast armaments and heavy taxation continue to curtail the buying power of Europe, so long will the food products of the Western Hemisphere go begging in search of a buyer. So long as the intergovernmental debts hang over Europe, so long will this tariff war be waged to the detriment of all, and not the least to the detriment of the American farmer.

To the extent that disarmament and a revision of governmental debts reduces this need for self-sufficiency to that extent is there hope for American agriculture. If the nations of Europe confine their productive efforts to those lines which their natural advantages and national talents make economically profitable, markets may be found for our surplus agricultural products. To that extent the American farmer has a very real interest in the League of Nations, the World Court, the revision of war debts, and the peace psychology of Europe.

But after we have settled the question of intergovernmental debts the fundamental problem of American agriculture will still await solution. We will still have to consider our domestic allotment plans, our mounting wheat surplus, our floods of tropical oils, our transportation problem, our farm-debt problem, and a score of other problems that must be settled in this country, rather than in Europe. The settlement of the intergovernmental debts, disarmament, and the removal of trade barriers are matters of the greatest immediate importance to the American farmer. But even so, they do not go to the root of his troubles.

#### FARMERS MUST OBTAIN FAIR PRICE FOR PRODUCTS

Inasmuch as industry is concerned fully as much with the consumption as it is with production, it would appear that it is of the gravest import to industry that agriculture should attain the consumptive capacity which its productive capacity justifies. Now the only method by which this can be achieved is to accord to agriculture a fair exchange for its products. In the changes in our social and economic systems that must inevitably follow the present period agriculture must receive the consideration that its part in our social and economic life demands.

The problem is squarely up to the leaders of industry and finance. It is they who must solve the problem. Too long have they looked upon it as a political rather than an economic problem. Too long have they viewed it as something of interest only to the West while they have scurried around the world looking for new markets for their products. The time is past, if it ever existed, when the problems of agriculture can be left to agricultural economists and agricultural experts. The financial and industrial economists must set to work on this problem. They must discover ways and means for the industrial utilization of our surplus and marginal acreage which is glutting the world's food market. We have these acres and we have people on them, and it is up to our industrial and financial leaders to see that they have consumptive power. This is a plain business proposition. We have 30,000,000 American people who do not have to be trained or cajoled into the usage of American-made goods. Their standard of living requires no elevation. They constitute the best market that exists to-day in the world for American industry, and American industrial leaders will be incomprehensibly blind if they do not see this opportunity.

#### SOLUTION OF PROBLEM MEANS AMERICAN WELFARE

By now we all realize that the agricultural problem is not a problem that concerns the farmer alone, it concerns banks and all other loan agencies. Bank failures and mortgage foreclosures have made that clear to us. It concerns our transportation agencies. And it concerns our industrial agencies. American industry can no longer labor under the delusion that cheap food means cheaper labor and cheaper production. Cheap food no longer means cheap labor. Cheap food means less buying power among 30,000,000 of our people. It is your problem, gentlemen. It is a problem that demands the best brains of the country and it is a problem that can no longer be shoved into the background as something that will be settled by the passage of time. You have at your command the successful leadership of this Nation. Within any one of the boards of directors on which you sit, there is more intelligent leadership than can be credited to all the farmers of this country, sympathetic and well meaning as are most of our farm leaders. I ask you, as a representative of a vast agricultural empire that has made your industrial, financial, and commercial successes possible—an empire upon whose prosperity your prosperity of the future depends—to accept a responsibility that rests squarely upon you.

I can not conceive that we will ever have a prosperous America, with one-quarter of its population steadily sinking to the low level of peasantry. We must face this fact, otherwise any plan or scheme of recovery which we may contemplate will have within it a serious flaw that will quickly bring about its failure.

On the other hand, if American industry and American finance will set its mind to the solution of the farm problem, I am sure we can bring about an era of prosperity to the United States which will be continuous and free from the disastrous slumps that have marked our past. We can bring about a social contentment that will make for the security of our Government and the principles upon which it was founded.

#### AMENDMENT OF RADIO ACT OF 1927—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was recommended the bill (H. R. 7716) to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1004) thereon.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 5180) granting an increase of pension to Lillian M. Hoxie (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 5181) granting a pension to Calvin C. Manley (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5182) granting a pension to Hazel Tripp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5183) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5184) to amend section 7 of the act of Congress of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. L. 768; U. S. C., title 21, sec. 8), as amended; and

A bill (S. 5185) to amend section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat and cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved July 5, 1932; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 5186) for the relief of Charles A. Brown; and

A bill (S. 5187) for the relief of Anna Marie Sanford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GLENN:

A bill (S. 5188) granting a pension to Francis Whitcomb Schultz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 215) to authorize crop-production loans in 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 216) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

#### PRINTING OF THE SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask that it may be read. I shall then request consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 305) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Seventy-third Congress, and that 2,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the committee, of which 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

Mr. MOSES. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### DEPORTATION OF SO-CALLED BONUS MARCHERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on the 12th instant I offered Senate Resolution 301, authorizing the appointment of a special committee to investigate the acts of certain officials in connection with the deportation of the so-called bonus marchers on July 28, 1932. I called the matter up on yesterday, and objection was made that it had not been referred to a standing committee. That objection was made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bingham]. It was a proper objection, and I desire that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which is the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Resolution 301 will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### POST EXCHANGES (S. DOC. NO. 149)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on November 23 the Acting Secretary of War sent to the Vice President, as required by the Army appropriation bill of last year, a letter transmitting a report on the operation of post exchanges. That was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.



## PROPOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Let us have the yeas and nays on the question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BORAH. Is the motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Are we now about to vote on a motion that the Senate go into executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the pending question. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], who is detained by illness. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] and vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOWELL. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL], and vote "yea."

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] is paired with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I understand that if the senior Senator from Florida were present he would vote "nay." If the junior Senator from Rhode Island were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is necessarily absent by reason of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. BAILEY (after having voted in the negative). I voted under the impression that a pair between myself and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] had been canceled. However, there is some question about it, so I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and let my vote stand.

Mr. HARRISON. My colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] is necessarily detained on account of illness.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] is absent on account of illness. It has been impossible to secure a pair for him; but I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. CONNALLY. I am paired with the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] and vote "nay."

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL], the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and not paired they would vote "yea" on the pending question.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 44, as follows:

## YEAS—37

Austin	Fess	Keyes	Schuyler
Bingham	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Glenn	Metcalf	Steiwer
Capper	Grammer	Moses	Townsend
Carey	Hale	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Couzens	Hastings	Nye	Watson
Cutting	Hatfield	Oddie	White
Dale	Howell	Patterson	
Davis	Johnson	Reed	
Dickinson	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	

## NAYS—44

Ashurst	Caraway	Hawes	Pittman
Bailey	Cohen	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Connally	Hull	Robinson, Ark.
Barkley	Coolidge	Kendrick	Sheppard
Black	Copeland	King	Shipstead
Blaine	Costigan	La Follette	Swanson
Bratton	Dill	Logan	Trammell
Broussard	George	Long	Tydings
Bulkley	Glass	McGill	Wagner
Bulow	Gore	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Walsh, Mont.

## NOT VOTING—15

Barbour	Hebert	Shortridge	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Lewis	Smith	Walcott
Fletcher	Norris	Stephens	Wheeler
Goldsborough	Schall	Thomas, Idaho	

So the Senate refused to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the vote which I just cast on the roll call, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit me.

I was not in the Chamber nor did I hear any of the debate, if there was any, as I was detained by a hearing in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to state, however, that I voted against the motion because I believed it was a motion which could have no other effect than to delay the consideration of the unfinished business of the Senate, in view of the announced attitude on the part of the minority in this Chamber that no nominations will be confirmed of appointees whose terms would extend beyond the 4th of March. Under the circumstances it would be a waste of the valuable time of the Senate to go into executive session at 12.15 o'clock in the afternoon. Any attempt to take up nominations would be the cause of protracted debate on the question of whether or not nominations are to be confirmed.

There is pressing need for the consideration of legislation affecting the welfare of the people of this country. Everyone knows that the minority have enough numerical strength to prevent a vote on any nominations. If we go into executive session we will be only frittering away the time of the Senate in a controversy as to whether nominees for post offices and other appointments are to be considered. To take such a futile course is but to indicate that this body is not competent to deal with the important questions that confront the United States and the world at this critical hour.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, touching the subject of executive nominations, many Senators concur in the opinion that during this short session nominations should be confined to instances in which the terms of office of the nominees expire on the 4th of March next and to what may be termed routine appointments in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, and, perhaps, some other executive departments.

In the short session of Congress which followed the election of 1920, the session which began December 6, 1920, and expired March 4, 1921, anticipating the change of administration, there were no executive sessions of the Senate. All executive business which was transacted at that session was completed during legislative session, as in open executive session, and by unanimous consent.

There is no objection to the immediate confirmation of a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Commerce. There will be no objection to the confirmation of appointees whose terms expire on the 4th of March or earlier.

As to the executive departments not embraced in the classification just referred to, there will be prompt action, so far as we know, touching all those routine nominations which have already been referred to. Other than these, we feel that nominations should not be confirmed.

I make that explanation, which I think is already quite generally understood by many Members of the Senate, but I make it in this presence in order that there may be a more general understanding of the attitude of many Senators.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator cited the action of the Senate in 1920. The Senate at that time was Republican, and we are following the precedent, of course, in this instance. The Senator omitted to state that the Republicans controlled the Senate at that time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I presumed that Senators would reach the conclusion that that precedent was the basis for this action. Moreover, I take it to be fair; and I thought Senators understood that.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is true the RECORD discloses that following the election of 1920 there were no executive sessions from the time of meeting in December until the termination of the session on the 4th of March; and, as well said by the able Senator from Mississippi, the Republicans were in control of the Senate by 49 to 47. Consequently, the Democrats could not have had any expectancy that an executive session would have profited them, for they were in the minority.

Now, Mr. President, the situation is quite the reverse. From the standpoint of organization, the Republicans are in control of the Senate, and there is every reason, on that account, why these nominations should be referred to standing committees having jurisdiction.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McNARY. I shall not yield for the present. I will yield a little later.

I was a Member of the Senate in 1920, and I recall the action taken as suggested by the able Senator from Arkansas. I do not, however, believe in the practice, even though I may have unwittingly participated therein. I do not think that following a bad precedent is good practice. I believe the Democratic organization is entitled, when it comes into power, to all the numerical political support it can receive; but at this time, with a Republican President in the White House and a Republican Senate, which must share with the House equal responsibility in the administration of affairs, it seems to me, Mr. President, in the interest of orderly procedure, that these nominations should be referred to standing committees and should be given careful consideration with respect to the intelligence and the capacity of those who have been nominated by the President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I shall yield later; not now.

I do not share the opinion of the able Senator from Wisconsin. This motion could not lead to interminable debate. Under the rules it is not debatable. All I was seeking was to have an executive session so that these nominations might be referred to the committees. No delay can occur in a matter of that kind.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McNARY. Inasmuch as I have referred to the Senator, I shall yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to say that it was my understanding, of course, that if we went into executive session we would follow the usual procedure, and that the calendar would be taken up. If that were done, I think the Senator knows full well that there would be interminable debate before any votes were had upon nominations that are pending on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator anticipates a situation which might or might not exist. These are capable men and their names have been sent here. They are men belonging to both parties—men whose names probably would reappear

here under the Democratic administration. I think the gentlemen whose names have been sent here are entitled to the faithful and decent consideration of the Senate and the committees to which the nominations should have been referred.

Inasmuch, however, as it pleased the Senate to decree otherwise, I shall have to submit; and I presume, in view of the present conditions, I must concede that the Republican Party must be thankful for small favors.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I just wanted to ask the Senator if he recalls the words in the Book of Proverbs?—

Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, I am not conversant with that particular citation. It has no real application. I stated a moment ago, if the Senator was listening carefully, that at the time when what he calls a pit was dug there were no picks used. The Republicans then were in the majority and the Democrats had no reasonable expectancy of any confirmations. Consequently there were no executive sessions. Conditions are reversed at this time, however—that is, they were before the roll call.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not at all criticize the attitude of the Senator from Oregon. He has referred himself to the fact that he participated in establishing the precedent that I cited a few moments ago; and when his ox is gored he regards it as a bad precedent.

To conclude the matter, I also point out that in the short session of 1920–21, already referred to, no messages containing nominations were referred. When brought to the Senate by the White House messenger, all messages were deposited with the executive clerk for safe-keeping. Later some of these messages were referred to committees—some during the latter part of January and others not until the last of February or the first of March. Most of these referred were reported out and confirmed the first or second day following reference.

That is the history of what was actually done.

#### CONFIRMATION OF ROY D. CHAPIN

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (continuing). Mr. President, in view of the fact that the President has sent to the Senate for confirmation a member of his Cabinet in the person of the Hon. Roy D. Chapin to be Secretary of Commerce, I ask unanimous consent, as in open executive session, that that nomination be considered and confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Chair, as in open executive session, lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read:

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I nominate Roy D. Chapin, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Robert P. Lamont, resigned.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 7, 1932.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination as in open executive session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified. The Senate will resume the consideration of the unfinished business in legislative session.

#### PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].



Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I desire at this time to offer an amendment, to lie on the table, to be voted on at the proper time; and I ask to have it read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read and lie upon the table.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from New Mexico offers the following amendment to House bill 7233:

On page 29, line 22, strike out the word "eleventh" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eighth."

On page 30, line 3, strike out the word "twelfth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ninth."

On page 30, line 8, strike out the word "thirteenth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "tenth."

On page 30, line 13, strike out the word "fourteenth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eleventh."

On page 30, line 18, strike out the word "fourteenth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eleventh."

So that subdivision (e) of section 6 shall read as follows:

"(e) The government of the commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall impose and collect an export tax on all articles that may be exported to the United States from the Philippine Islands free of duty under the provisions of existing law as modified by the foregoing provisions of this section, including the articles enumerated in subdivisions (a), (b), and (c), within the limitations therein specified, as follows:

"(1) During the eighth year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 5 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

"(2) During the ninth year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 10 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

"(3) During the tenth year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 15 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

"(4) During the eleventh year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 20 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries;

"(5) After the expiration of the eleventh year after the inauguration of the new government the export tax shall be 25 per cent of the rates of duty which are required by the laws of the United States to be levied, collected, and paid on like articles imported from foreign countries.

"The government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall place all funds received from such export taxes in a sinking fund, and such fund shall, in addition to other moneys available for that purpose, be applied solely to the payment of the principal and interest on the bonded indebtedness of the Philippine Islands, its Provinces, municipalities, and instrumentalities, until such indebtedness has been fully discharged.

"When used in this section in a geographical sense, the term "United States" includes all Territories and possessions of the United States, except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the island of Guam."

On page 37, line 9, strike out the word "fifteenth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twelfth."

On page 37, line 9, strike out the word "seventeenth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirteenth," so that subdivision (a) of section 9 shall read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) At any time after the expiration of the twelfth year and before the expiration of the thirteenth year after the inauguration of the government provided for in this act the people of the Philippine Islands shall vote on the question of Philippine independence. The Legislature of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall provide for the time and manner of an election for such purpose, at which the qualified voters of the Philippine Islands shall be entitled to vote."

On page 37, line 23, strike out "two" and insert "one."

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, the last amendment, striking out "two" and inserting "one," which I have discussed with the members of the committee as well as with the delegation from the Philippine Islands, will further accelerate the period of interim government and bring the period of independence one year closer.

According to the bill as it came from the committee, the President of the United States, after the issuance of a proclamation announcing the results of the election, shall have two years in which to withdraw. It is the opinion of the members of the committee, on further thought, that one year will be enough, and I notice that the substitute amendment of the Senator from Michigan provides only six months for the President to withdraw.

I wish to take a moment to explain very briefly the changes which this amendment, if it is adopted, will make in the bill as it came from the committee.

First, instead of a period of 10 years of limitation, plus a graduated step-up in export taxes for 5 years, this amendment provides for a 7-year period of limitation, plus the 5 years of successive step-ups.

Second, whereas the bill as it came from the committee gives two years for the plebiscite after the expiration of the final year of graded taxes, this suggested amendment will give them only one year; and, further, as I explained just now, it gives only one year instead of two for the President to withdraw from the islands.

The net gain in time is five years over the time which was set originally by the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The committee, although it still believes that a 15-year interim period is better than any other period which has been suggested, is actuated by deference to a very considerable sentiment in the Senate that the Philippines should be given their independence by the earliest possible date. We feel that by this amendment we are giving them independence at the earliest possible date consistent with the interest of the Philippine people and of the people of the United States.

I noticed in reading the remarks I made yesterday with regard to this question of graduated export taxes that my remarks might have been taken to imply that the only purpose of these graduated steps was to give the Philippine people an experience of the difficulties which they would have to confront under independence. That was one of the reasons, but there are several others. A very important reason was that this export tax will go toward paying the Philippine debt, and will leave them, at the beginning of independence, entirely free from indebtedness.

A third and very important consideration was that unless there are these graduated step-ups, the people of the islands will be plunged at once from a free-trade basis with the United States to a basis where they will have to compete with the world markets. I think that ought to be said, so that the Senate may know the various considerations which moved the committee to adopt this system of graduated export taxes.

I hope that this amendment may meet the views of the Members of the Senate. I think that, in so far as the saving of the latter two years is concerned, the year of saving for the plebiscite, and the year of saving in final withdrawal, the amendment is an actual improvement on the bill as it came from the committee. The reason why I wish to make this statement now is that it is due to the facts which I have stated this morning, and to the facts which I stated yesterday afternoon, that a large majority of the membership of the committee is opposed to the adoption of the amendment of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]. I wanted to make my position clear in this matter before the vote was taken on the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I follow the Senator's schedule correctly, the practical fact would be, under the amendment, that independence would arrive completely in perhaps 14 years, minimum. Is that a correct calculation?

Mr. CUTTING. Yes; I think so. That is my conception of it.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. In stating that that would be the maximum, that does not mean that that would be the period. It could be accomplished in 13 years, or 12½ years, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. CUTTING. That, of course, is true. Fourteen years is the maximum.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am not quite clear as to whether I understood the interrogation of the Senator from Missouri and the reply or not. As I understood the question and the reply, the period at which independence might be obtained might be reduced to 12½ years. Did the amendment which was offered by the Senator contemplate that such a minimum as that would be permissible?

Mr. CUTTING. I will explain to the Senator exactly what the amendment provides. It provides, first, for 7 years of limitation; then for 5 years of gradual, annual tariff step-ups; then a maximum of 1 year within which a plebiscite is to be held. That may be as much less as the Philippine people are able to arrange. Fourth, a maximum period of 1 year after the people have voted for independence within which the United States is to withdraw from the islands. So the 14 years is a maximum, and 12 years plus whatever additional time is requisite for these various steps is the minimum time. I do not know whether it would be 12½ or 12¾ years.

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand it, after the plebiscite shall have been held, and it affirmatively appears that the people desire independence, the President would have one year, as a maximum, within which to issue his proclamation freeing the Philippines from the control of the United States?

Mr. CUTTING. Yes; that is correct. The net saving of time under this bill is five years over the provisions of the bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. As I recall it, the amendment states that independence shall take effect 13 years after the inauguration of the government provided for in this act. The Senator knows it would take one and a half years to inaugurate the government; and stating that independence will come in 14 years is not exactly correct, is it?

Mr. CUTTING. My idea of all of the questions asked has been that they were with reference to the time of the interim government.

Mr. BROUSSARD. In other words, the vote is to be taken between 15 and 16 years hence?

Mr. CUTTING. The Senator means from the present time?

Mr. BROUSSARD. From the present time.

Mr. CUTTING. I suppose that is probably a correct statement; but I would also call the Senator's attention to the fact that unless the bill is framed in such a way as to be acceptable to the Philippine Legislature, there will be no independence at all, no interim government, and no way of telling how long present conditions may endure.

Mr. BROUSSARD. So far as I am concerned, I sat on the committee and heard all the evidence, and I am still receiving letters from the Philippine Islands. The Philippine people are willing now to take a period of five years, and the other day they recommended waiving that five years and recommended that their commission support the Hare bill, providing for a period of eight years. So that if we are to consider the desires of the Philippine people, and not the desires of those who have investments there, I would say that we have no right to defer independence until there may be a vote by a new generation of voters as to whether or not they should have their independence.

May I be permitted to say, in addition, Mr. President, that it is proposed now that the Government of the United States divest itself of certain of its sovereignty, and delegate that portion which we are to waive to a future generation in the Philippine Islands, to discharge a trust. That is not the way to discharge a trust. We must decide now whether in our opinion the people of the Philippines want independence. If they do, we ought to fix a certain specified time, and ask them to adopt a constitution. If they adopt a constitution, the only interpretation anybody can put on it is that

they want independence, and we should not leave it to their sons. If we do, those who fought in 1898 and 1899 will all be dead by the time the plebiscite arrives. The veterans of that war will not participate as independent citizens of the Philippines at all.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I will not venture to make any protracted debate on the merits of the proposition, but I would like to say, on behalf of the committee, that their conception of the matter was that the people who had a right to vote on whether they were to be independent or not were the people who were alive at the time when independence was to be submitted. That is in line with the statement of almost every President of the United States, and at the proper time I mean to place in the RECORD especially strong statements by President Roosevelt, President Taft, and President Coolidge as to the necessity of the Philippine people being consulted on this question of independence. I feel that the committee has, so far as possible, tried to carry out those recommendations.

Of course, the Senator from Louisiana is correct in saying that a great many people of the Philippine Islands desire independence within a shorter period than is granted in this bill; but I would point out that whatever action the Philippine Legislature may take is, like the action of other legislative bodies which we may have in mind, a speculative one, and nobody can tell how the legislature will act on this or any other proposition.

The only thing that is quite certain as to the time limit is that, under the amendment which I have just proposed, the time limit will be cut down five years from the time suggested by the original bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I recall very well, a Delegate from the Philippine Islands in time past, making a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives with reference to Philippine independence. I rose and asked him whether or not the people there would be willing to set up a period of time within which they could prepare, both here and there, for independence. The reply was, "Eventually; why not now?"

Yet there seems to be an impression here that five years or eight years is too short a time. I am for the 5-year period.

I believe that if the Philippines can not adjust themselves to independence within a 5-year period they can not do it within an 8-year period. They have been working toward the end of independence all these years. That is their hope. In view of the fact that there are sugar investments over there by American people, it seems to me, they ought to be able to adjust themselves to a 5-year period, and therefore we are serving both the Philippines and our own interests if we will adjust this bill to a 5-year period. That is the reason why I have offered an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana making the period five years instead of eight years.

Mr. President, I should like to read a letter which I have received from various farm organizations of the country with reference to this subject:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1932.

Senator L. J. DICKINSON,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DICKINSON: At a conference of officials of national agricultural organizations, the names of whom you will find attached to this communication, held in this city on Monday, December 12, a resolution was unanimously adopted indorsing the statement of principles which should be applied to the pending legislation in Congress for Philippine independence, which has already been submitted to you. This statement of principles is as follows:

1. That complete independence should be provided within a period of five years.
2. That trade relationships between the United States and the Philippine Islands should be adjusted within this 5-year period either by fixing a quota of imports which, beginning with the adoption of a constitution by the people of the Philippine Islands, will be gradually reduced each year until complete independence, or by a gradual application of tariff rates which will be increased each year until final independence.
3. That provisions in pending bills for trade conferences prior to the end of the transition period, which contemplate or imply further trade concessions, should be eliminated.



4. That we oppose any provision to reopen the question of final independence after the Philippine people have adopted their constitution.

As expressed in this conference, it is the unanimous opinion of the farm groups that in the interest of the welfare of agriculture prompt action in accordance with the principles above stated must be taken.

We commend you for the position you are taking on this question, and urge you to bring to the attention of all members of the Senate the deep interest of the farm people of America in the question of Philippine independence.

Very respectfully,

M. S. WINDER,  
Secretary of the Conference.

At that conference there was this personnel in attendance:

American Farm Bureau Federation: E. A. O'Neal, president; Charles E. Hearst, vice president; Earl C. Smith, director and president of the Illinois Agricultural Association; George M. Putnam, director and president of the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation; M. S. Winder, secretary-treasurer; Chester H. Gray, Washington representative; and Ralph Snyder, president Kansas State Farm Bureau.

National Grange: L. J. Taber, national master; Fred J. Freestone, executive committee; Fred Brenckman, legislative representative.

Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America: John A. Simpson, president; W. P. Lamberton, director.

Farmers Equity Union: Leroy Melton, president.

American Cotton Cooperative Association: W. B. Blalock, president; C. O. Moser, vice president; W. N. Williamson, director; C. G. Henry, director.

Farmers National Grain Corporation: C. E. Huff, president; M. W. Thatcher, legislative representative.

National Livestock Marketing Association: Charles Ewing, president; E. A. Beamer, director; Dr. O. O. Woolf, director.

National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation: John D. Miller, director; George Slocum, director; Fred Sexour, director; Charles W. Holman, secretary.

National Wool Marketing Co.: Dr. O. O. Woolf, director.

National Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Association: A. B. Leefer, president; C. V. Cochran, director.

Northern Wisconsin Tobacco Pool: Emerson Ela, president.

Farm press: C. V. Gregory, Prairie Farmer; F. R. Eastman, American Agriculturist; Dan Wallace, the Farmer; Dr. B. F. Kilgore, Progressive Farmer.

National Committee of Farm Organizations: Ralph Snyder, president.

The letter which I have just read is the consensus of opinion of the leading and outstanding farm organizations in the country with reference to the question. It is for this reason that I am in sympathy with the provisions of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, and yet I should like to see 3 years more cut off and the time made 5 years instead of 8 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator advise me whether the conference was informed in any respect or discussed in any degree the effect in the Philippine Islands of this contemplated program, and whether or not it was a practical proposition to succeed with the shorter enterprise, or was the consideration exclusively domestic?

Mr. DICKINSON. They have had a committee working on the question for two or three years. I think there is not a phase of the question, either in this country or in the Philippine Islands, that has not been given sincere consideration by this group. If it comes to a question where to protect the interests of the farmers of this country or the producers over there, naturally this group would say they want their own interests protected first. I think this program will work out to the mutual interest of the people of this country and of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may continue my interrogation, the Senator probably would concede, however, that if we agreed upon an impractical program—in other words, one which did not and could not actually work without precipitating a collapse—that perhaps the net result would be a loss instead of a saving of time. Might not that be?

Mr. DICKINSON. Certainly, that might be. The Philippine representatives who have been coming to this country during my experience of 12 or 14 years have all insisted that they are ready for independence. So far as the theory of government and the responsibility of government is con-

cerned, they have assumed that they are ready to take the leadership and carry on. The thing to be adjusted is the business interests, and I think five years is ample time for that purpose. I fully believe that the legislature in the Philippine Islands will ratify a 5-year bill. Therefore I am anxious that we may have a vote on the amendment which I have submitted.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, during the discussion of the tariff bill three years ago the representatives of the organizations to which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] has referred made strenuous efforts to secure a tariff on Philippine products and to cut down the amount of sugar which might come into the United States. The Senator from Iowa was at that time a Member of the House, I believe, and will remember the bills which were before the House, the so-called Timberlake bill and others, providing for a reduction in the amount of sugar coming into the United States, and that there was a strenuous effort by the farm organizations to secure a tariff on the products coming from the Philippine Islands.

The matter was debated in the Senate. Their proposal received the support of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and others. However, the position taken by the Senate was that as long as they were under the American flag they should have the right of trade with us, and we should not erect barriers against them, which position seemed to me to be feasible. But at that time, in the hearings and debates in the Finance Committee with the representatives of the farm organizations, the threat was made that if they could not secure protection against Philippine products they would then take up the question of securing Philippine independence.

At that time interest in Philippine independence was at a very low ebb in this country. In fact, in the Philippine Islands themselves, while it was the battle cry of both political parties that they both wanted immediate and full independence, yet the people had become adjusted to the fact that they probably would not secure it, and there was no strenuous activity in that regard. But when the farmers found they could not secure from the Congress a protective tariff against the Philippine Islands, they then took up the serious matter of agitating for Philippine independence.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. KING. Is the Senator quite accurate in his statement, if I understood him correctly, that activity for independence in the Philippine Islands had reached a low ebb? My recollection is that for many years, 10 or 15 years, there was constant demand from the Philippine Islands for independence. It is true that after a committee had come while President Coolidge was in the White House, and he had indicated his opposition to independence, and that opposition seemed to impregnate the whole administration, there was a feeling—I was about to say of despair—upon the part of Filipinos—at least many of them felt—so long as Mr. Coolidge was in the White House, with persons of his political views with respect to Philippine independence, there might not be any chance for independence.

But I recall that even then, and in succeeding years since, I have received many resolutions from municipalities and from Provinces and many communications from Filipinos insisting that the Philippine question was not dead, or even moribund, and insisting that Philippine independence be granted. So I hope the Senator will qualify his statement if he intended to convey the meaning that the Filipinos had abandoned the idea of independence during the period to which he referred.

Mr. BINGHAM. No; the Senator, as the chief advocate on the floor of the Senate of immediate independence, is quite correct in all his statements. The position I was taking was in reply to remarks made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] about the great interest of farmers in independence. I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me it was not until the farmers found they could not secure



a protective tariff against the Philippines—and he was one of those who stood with me in the matter—that as long as the flag was flying over the Philippines we should not erect tariff barriers between ourselves and our colonies—that the farmers began to take an active interest in Philippine independence.

In the hearings before the Senate and House committees on the bill now before the Senate the farmers had a chance to express themselves through their organizations and their representatives, and they did so; and it is an extremely strange thing to find—their testimony having been heard and received careful consideration by the Senate committee, which devoted weeks and months to a study of this problem and evolved a bill which it was believed would be as far as possible satisfactory to all parties in the case—that the farmers and their representatives now meet in a room in the Capitol and tell us what to do.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am sure the Senator will qualify a remark he made a moment ago. I have been a member of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs for 12 years. There has never been one minute of that time when there was not a bill pending to give independence to the Philippine Islands—not only one, but several.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BROUSSARD. During that period the committee acted favorably—and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] was on the committee at the time—on two or three bills which were never acted on in the Senate because the administration was opposed to them. The matter never was considered on the floor of the Senate and never reached the calendar of the Senate. There had been sincere advocates for independence during all that period. Not only that, but there are some of us who have advocated it in the Senate for the last 30 years. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut means that Senators here who have been advocating independence shall be included in the category of which he speaks as those who are now becoming advocates of independence because they could not put a limitation on the importation of Filipino products.

There was a limitation on sugar, rice, tobacco, and other commodities as Filipino products before 1913. If the farmers to-day are asking for limitations, they are merely following in the footsteps of those who determined the original policy of Congress toward Philippine importations; and because we are asking for independence and because those who oppose independence want to protract the period so long that we are forced to ask for limitations, to turn around and impute to us ulterior motives is not the proper attitude. The shoe is on the other foot. I see gentlemen here now supporting the 20-year period with a plebiscite who are absolutely opposed to independence. Those who favor independence offer independence, but some of them favor a long period. I would not castigate them or any portion of them or charge them with any ulterior motives.

I ask the Senator to qualify that remark, because I have been an advocate of independence for the Philippine Islands ever since I left the Philippine Islands in 1900. I have advocated freedom during all that time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Louisiana thought my remarks referred to him at all in a derogatory way, because that was farthest from my thoughts.

The Senator from Louisiana, ever since I have known him during the eight years I have been here, has been a steady and consistent advocate of complete independence for the Philippines; year after year he has put up a fight for what he believed to be right and has in no way changed his position. I am sorry that he should have thought my remarks could be construed as imputing any change whatever on his part. My remarks were directed to the fact that interest in Philippine independence in the United States had come to be at a very low ebb. The Senator

from Utah [Mr. KING] will agree with me in that statement, I think, for he and the Senator from Louisiana and a few others were constantly working toward that end.

I think the Senator from Utah will not object to my referring to the fact that it was commonly reported that in the Democratic convention held in Houston, Tex., when the question of the platform came up, the Republican convention at Kansas City having taken no action in its platform in regard to Philippine independence, the Senator from Utah was insistent that the Democratic Party should go on record, as it had repeatedly done in the past, for complete independence.

Mr. KING. And as it did.

Mr. BINGHAM. And the convention followed his wishes; but I think the Senator will also agree with me that interest in Philippine independence in the United States was at a low ebb until the farmers found in 1929, after the vote on the floor of the Senate, that they could not secure protection against Philippine products. Then it was that they began an active agitation for Philippine independence. I think the Senator will agree with me in that.

Mr. KING. I do.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Dickinson] for many reasons. One of the reasons which, perhaps, has not been mentioned on the floor is the fact that our people in the United States invested more than a quarter of a billion dollars in the Philippines. The table placed in the record, both in the House hearings and in the Senate hearings, shows capital investments in the Philippines, exclusive of investments in governmental agencies, as being—and I give merely the round numbers—real estate, \$12,000,000; bank capital, \$800,000; bonds, \$113,000,000—and that includes bonds issued by the Philippine government and by municipalities; manufacturing industries, \$35,000,000; mercantile establishments, \$30,000,000; agriculture, \$10,000,000; forests and lumber, \$2,000,000; fish and fisheries, \$6,000,000; and all others, \$45,000,000; a total of about \$257,000,000.

Mr. President, I know it will be stated that when our citizens invest their money in foreign countries that is their own lookout; that when they buy the bonds of foreign countries and attempt to secure upon them a yield of 8, 9, or 10 per cent they must realize that they are running great risk, and perhaps naturally must pay the penalty of what they are attempting to do when they undertake to obtain such high rates of interest; but when they were investing in the Philippines, they were doing it at the urgent request of officers of the United States Government. I do not recollect a single governor general going out to the Philippines for 25 years who did not, sooner or later, urge the people of the United States to invest in the Philippines, calling attention to the natural resources of the islands, to the ways in which money could be wisely invested in public utilities, steam and electric railroads, tram lines, telephone service, plantations, lumber companies, rubber companies, and so on. The American people have followed their advice to the extent of more than \$250,000,000, including more than \$100,000,000 in Government bonds, which were issued under the advertisements offered by the War Department, presumably under Government auspices, not bonds yielding a high rate of interest, but I venture to say that of the \$116,000,000 of bonds issued by the Philippine government and municipalities none of them carried more than 5 per cent, and that more than \$95,000,000 of them carried only about 4½ per cent, showing that there was no great risk involved. Why? Not because the Philippines were under the American flag, but because investors in this country supposed that the American Government would, in a way, look out for their investments; and it is proper to protect these citizens of ours who have placed their capital in the islands while they were under our flag—not in a foreign country, but in a colony of the United States—and it seems to me fair that we should give as long a period of time as possible for them to get out of their investments and to enable the bonds to be amortized. For that reason, I have been a consistent advocate of a period of 25 or 30 years, so as to permit amorti-



zation without hurting the Philippines or the Americans who have invested their capital in those islands.

I accepted as a compromise the suggestion of the committee that the total length of time should be about 18 years, not because I believed it would be sufficient to prevent very serious losses on the part of Americans who had invested capital in the Philippine Islands, but because I believed that it was the most that we could get, and that this was the best bill that we could get. Now the proposal comes, forsooth, that we must get out in five years. What then will become of the investments which we have encouraged to be made under our flag and in our own colony?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DICKINSON. I wonder whether the Senate should be more interested in the investor who has invested in the Philippines or in the farmer who has invested in a farm in this country and is engaged in the production of sugar or dairy products, and whether or not we ought to sacrifice the investments in those two products in this country in order to help keep the faith to which the Senator says we are committed in order to help the investor get out of the Philippines with the money he has invested there.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not think there should be any preference given in these matters. I do not think there should be any preference given to the man who has two or three thousand dollars and who has put it into a farm over the man who has two or three thousand dollars and has put it into some enterprise in our colonies under the flag. Nor do I think there should be any preference given to the man who has put two or three thousand dollars in the Philippines under our flag over the farmer who has put two or three thousand dollars into his farm. I should like to see fair play as between them both, but the Senator in his proposal does not give fair play to the man who has put his money into the Philippine Islands.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if there is any possibility of adjustment within the 5-year period? I understand that the money invested in sugar in the Philippines is the largest investment and that approximately 60 per cent of that investment is Philippine owned, not American owned. It would seem to me to be an easy matter for them to adjust matters in some way within the 5-year period.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator is not well informed. The table shows that of the 257,000,000 American dollars invested in the Philippines only \$10,000,000 are invested in agriculture, which, I presume, is mostly in sugar plantations.

Mr. DICKINSON. Then it is the outside investments, and not the sugar investment that the Senator wants protected? What are these investments in if they are not in sugar?

Mr. BINGHAM. I read the table giving in round numbers the various items a few moments ago. The investments, amounting to \$257,000,000, include \$113,000,000 of bonds, government and municipal bonds, and so forth. That is the largest item. The next largest item is the amount invested in manufacturing industries, \$35,000,000. The next is in the mercantile establishments, \$30,000,000; in agriculture, \$10,000,000. It is possible that a part of the \$35,000,000 in manufacturing industries may be invested in the manufacture of sugar; of that I am not certain, but I will give the benefit of the doubt as to that.

Mr. DICKINSON. In other words, it is the investment in general business over there that the Senator is attempting to protect?

Mr. BINGHAM. The investments in the Philippines of all kinds, chiefly in bonds which our people have taken at a low rate of interest, believing that the United States Government would protect them in their investments, the interest being only about 4½ per cent, or the same as that on State and municipal obligations in the United States.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question. It is my understanding that the suggestion has been made by the supporters of the bill that the Philip-

pine Islands might not ratify this bill if it made too short the time when independence should become a fact. If it comes to a question of the extension of the time, I would rather the request to extend the time beyond five years would come from the Philippine Islands by action of their legislature than to have the American Congress say that they need 18 years, when they have been here before the present Congress, and for 15 years previously, saying, "We are ready for independence now."

Mr. BINGHAM. As the Senator has corrected his remarks by reminding us that for all these years the Philippine Legislature and Members on both sides have been elected on a platform calling for immediate independence, his request that we find out whether they would prefer 5 or 18 years is not entirely disingenuous.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The Senator from Connecticut has called attention to various bonds which were issued and purchased, as I understand, by American citizens. There were certain bonds issued by the Philippine government. Is that correct?

Mr. BINGHAM. About \$97,000,000, I should think, of the \$116,000,000 were issued by the Philippine government, advertised through the War Department, and sold in this country.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And we are proceeding upon the assumption that those bonds are held by American citizens, are we?

Mr. BINGHAM. Not entirely on that assumption. In regard to those bonds particularly, we must recognize the fact that they were sold on the recommendation and under the advertisement of the War Department.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I grant that.

Mr. BINGHAM. And that we may be held morally though not legally responsible for them. I will add that, of course, we can not expect the Philippine government to meet its indebtedness on those bonds or pay the bonds if the islands become bankrupt and their industries are destroyed. It is the thought of the authors of the bill—and I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] will agree with me in this particular—that the section of the bill referring to the graduated export tax was written in an endeavor to protect the bondholders. I think that is correct.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If the Senator will permit me to pursue the inquiry, I have understood, and the burden of the argument is, that these government bonds were purchased by American citizens and held by American citizens, wherefore we must by legislation protect the holders of those bonds and for the reason which has been stated.

Mr. BINGHAM. Not because they were bought by American citizens, but because they were issued under the ægis of the United States Government.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I repeat my thought. I have understood throughout this discussion that as to those government bonds we were seeking to protect their present owners and holders upon the assumption that they were American citizens.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Are they English? Are they French? Are they Italian? Are the holders of the bonds in question foreigners?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does not seem to me that that is the question at issue at all, any more than it is as to who holds the Liberty bonds of the United States. In good faith those bonds must be paid, principal and interest, whether they are all held by foreigners or are held by Americans. Similarly the Philippine bonds have been issued under the ægis of the United States Government. We are morally bound to protect them and to protect their holders, whether they be American citizens or not.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That may well be. Then the Senator's argument is that the Philippine government will not be able or disposed—

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, Mr. President; I did not say that.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. To honor and pay those bonds at maturity. Is that the argument?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President; neither by direct language nor by inference did I refer to any such disposition on the part of the Philippine government. I am sure that the Philippine government will be disposed to give them priority and to pay them, principal and interest, as they come due, as any honest government would do. I never implied anything different from that. But, Mr. President, if their national bank is brought down to failure, as has been pointed out on this floor would be the case if the sugar industry of the islands should be destroyed and the islands become bankrupt, it will be impossible for them to pay.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In other words, then, there is no intention to question the good faith and the honorable intent of the Philippine government which is to be set up?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly not, Mr. President.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The argument goes as to its ability to meet the obligations?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Very well. Now, as to these several bonds issued by corporations or associations in the Philippines, is it the Senator's position that they severally will be unable or indisposed to meet their obligations if we grant independence to the islands?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President. I am not informed as to any bonds of the kind to which the Senator refers. I am referring to the fact that according to the testimony taken before the committee American citizens have placed in that country, under the flag, an investment of something like \$250,000,000, of which a part is in municipal and state bonds. A great many of our citizens, several thousands of our citizens, have gone there to engage in business. Some of our principal steamship lines—notably the Dollar Line out of San Francisco and Seattle—have steamers running there, and about half of their business is concerned with shipments to and from the Philippine Islands. A great many of our citizens have been induced by their fellow citizens to invest their capital in mercantile, agricultural, mineral, and other establishments in the Philippine Islands; and it seems to me that in justice to them, just as much as in justice to the farmers of whom the Senator from Iowa has just been speaking, a sufficient length of time should be given to permit them to get out of their investments, if they desire to do so, without incurring any more loss than is necessary.

In other words, if we were to grant the Filipinos what they ask—namely, immediate and complete independence—it would ruin many of our own citizens unnecessarily, it seems to me, as well as ruin the Philippine Islands themselves. If we grant them a sufficient period of time—which, frankly, I do not think could be said to be less than 25 years, because of the difficulty of amortizing bonds in a period less than that, but I agreed to 18 years because that was the best I could do under the circumstances—at any rate, it will give our people who have gone there in good faith under the flag and our people who have sent their money there in good faith under the flag an opportunity to retire with as little loss as possible.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I rose to interrupt the Senator to inquire more particularly in respect of bonds that were issued and held. As to other investments, that involves another line of thought.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no information before me in regard to the amount of bonds issued and held by companies such as the Senator refers to.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I see. The argument is that unless this long period of time is given, the holders of bonds as well as the investors in individual enterprises there will suffer loss.

Mr. BINGHAM. They certainly will, Mr. President.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And that those who may suffer loss are American citizens, or possibly foreign citizens and subjects, owning, having acquired, the bonds issued and which are under consideration. Perhaps this is an idle question; but does not the Senator think that within 5 or 6 or 7 or 8

years matters will adjust themselves, unless the whole world goes into chaos?

I say the question is idle in view of the views expressed by the Senator; but, having such respect for the learning and the logical mind of the Senator from Connecticut, I venture again to put the question to him and to others: Will not seven or eight years be ample for American citizens to adjust themselves commercially? Or, finally, will the Senator answer this question: As between the two, the holder of bonds and the California farmer or the Iowa farmer—I have affection for Iowa, although it went wrong—

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator was born there, if I remember correctly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; that is the great distinction of my life. As between the American farmer, though, the planter and raiser of wheat or of cane in Louisiana, and some American citizen or foreigner now who has interests in the Philippines, should we not give the preference to the California farmer or the Iowa farmer? Is not that our duty as Senators representing the United States of America?

My question indicates my views.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I do not like to say anything which might seem to be an appeal to sentiment. I realize that anyone who in these days speaks in favor of a capitalist is at once the target for all sorts of criticisms and insinuations; but I was brought up to think that there is such a thing as looking after the property of widows and orphans, if one must mention a matter of that kind; that there are in this world and in America many thousands of widows and orphans whose property consists in a certain little collection of bonds and stocks; and if that is wiped out and there is no return on that investment, then they suffer just as much as does the sturdy farmer who has worked hard to raise his crops and is unable to find an adequate market for them.

I dislike to mention the subject, because it seems like an appeal to sentiment; but after all, Mr. President, a farmer who has his occupation and his health and ability to raise food, even though he may suffer from inability to buy the things he wants, is not as badly off as are many of our people, not only in New England but all over the United States to-day, who are living on little investments that have been made for them—little old ladies who have no opportunity to earn anything, but who are trying to eke out a modest competence on what was left them, either in the way of life insurance or in little investments in companies under the American flag. Surely the Senator would not say that they have no right to be considered in comparison with the farmers of California and Iowa, or even the farmers of Connecticut.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Perhaps I can relieve the difficulty a little bit by suggesting that there are some foreigners in the Philippines who have rights. For instance, a great many Chinese have gone into the Philippines in good faith. They are not capitalists in the sense in which the Senator speaks. They are small capitalists, perhaps; but they are artisans and laborers. I understand, too, that from one-half to three-fourths of the fluid wealth of the Philippines is owned or directed by the 55,000 Chinese residents of those islands. That statement has been made to me, and I have no doubt it is correct.

May I ask the Senator, are the rights and interests of these small holders of the Philippines guarded by the pending measure? Are they taken care of in some way so that they will not lose their all by reason of any change in policy?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, of course that does bring in another question, as to whether the people who have gone to the Philippine Islands while the islands are under our flag, and have invested their money there, even if they be foreigners, are entitled to any consideration by us. The figures in the table to which I have referred show that there is an investment by Chinese subjects of about \$109,000,000.



I assume, however, that it is not our duty to any very great extent to protect those who have deliberately gone in there and placed their investments in those islands on the supposition that we were going to remain there indefinitely. I am not so interested in protecting them as I am in protecting the American holders of securities, such as savings banks, insurance companies, and the little investors.

I do not believe that there are any large investors who have put much money into the Philippine Islands. I never heard of that, but that does not seem to me to be really the matter at issue. The question is as to whether, in getting out of the Philippine Islands, we are going to get out in a period of time which will cause the maximum of suffering or the minimum of suffering.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I am sure he would not care to have the implication go into the Record that he is interested only in Americans, the old ladies of whom he spoke, because surely we have an obligation to the nationals of other countries also.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true, Mr. President. A few moments ago, in discussing the matter with the Senator from California, I stated to him that it made no difference to me whether the bonds were held by American citizens or others; that they were issued under the aegis of the United States Government, and that we were morally bound to protect them because they had been issued under our auspices.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BROUSSARD. May I ask the Senator to say, if he will, whether the question which the Senator from New York raises would not involve the question of whether or not we should continue a subsidy, to the detriment of the American people, because there are people of other nationalities in the Philippine Islands who have investments there? That is a question that ought to solve itself.

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will discuss that question in his own time with the Senator from New York.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The subsidy that this Government extends to the products of the Philippine Islands inures to the benefit of all those who have investments there; and we are asked here to continue that subsidy to the nationals of other countries at the expense of the farmers and the producers of this country.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, my chief interest in the matter is to try to do all I can to see that we deal fairly with those who have gone into the Philippines, either physically or with their funds, because our flag was flying there, and because there was a certain moral duty on the part of the United States to protect the people in those islands and the property in those islands.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. SHIPSTEAD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the point in immediate controversy, of course, is the question of time.

The Senator will remember that in a colloquy with the Senator from New Mexico earlier in the afternoon it was estimated that 14 years would be involved in the completion of the formula which his latest amendment contemplates.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now, Mr. President, I want to get the view of the Senator, who is chairman of the committee reporting the legislation, respecting section 1 as it relates to the question of time. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 1 authorizes the Philippine Legislature to provide for the election of delegates, and so forth. I ask the Senator whether the Philippine Legislature is completely a free agent in determining when it shall execute that commission; and if it is completely a free agent, in the final analysis, if the bill be passed in its present form, are we not entirely at the mercy of the Philippine Legislature in respect to the actual time which will be consumed?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct, Mr. President.

My attention has been called to the fact that Congress encouraged the purchase of Philippine bonds by making them tax exempt, which only goes to show that those who bought them, realizing that they paid a low rate of interest and that they had been made tax exempt by our Government, did not suppose that they were purchasing foreign bonds.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smoot in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate to make any extended remarks, but for just a moment I would like to say that, in view of this discussion about the sanctity of investments, we must also bear in mind the investments in agricultural lands here on the part of farmers, who have been carrying the load for importers from the Philippines, soap interests, and sugar interests. I think we should bear in mind the investment of the farmer, who is losing his investment now to some extent—in fact, to a large extent—for the benefit of the capital invested in the Philippines.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true. I think the Senator was not on the floor when I called attention to the fact that I wanted, as far as I was concerned, to deal fairly by all American citizens in this subject, but that I saw no reason for preferring the little investor over the farmer or the farmer over the little investor. After all, the amount of coconut oil imported from the Philippine Islands is only about 3 per cent of the amount of fats used in this country. The amount of sugar which is being brought in at the present time is not much over 11 or 12 per cent, and, so far as the beet-sugar States are concerned, sugar is being produced and sold in Cuba at the present time at about one-fourth of what it costs us to produce beet sugar in the Western States. The Senator is not going to bring prosperity back to the beet-sugar farmer by immediately casting the Philippines loose and placing their imports on a tariff basis. He is not going to increase the price of dairy products by placing a small limitation on coconut oil. The farmers are going to be disappointed, the Senator's friends are going to be greatly disappointed, if they think they are going to receive any immediate or material benefit from an act which may do great injustice to our wards and which will be contrary to our moral obligations in so far as they may be carried out.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question, merely for information?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The Senator has called attention to the fact that these bonds were exempt from tax. About how long have they been outstanding, if the Senator has the information?

Mr. BINGHAM. I regret that I have not the information. There have been repeated issues of Government bonds, amortized from time to time by the War Department. I do not find in my records here a statement in that regard. But may I say to the Senator that the Senator from New Mexico, who made a special study of the matter, assured us that they could be all paid off by the Philippine government, principal and interest, if the plan which he evolved, of having an export duty to be increased year by year over a period of five years, could be put into effect, the revenue derived from that export duty on Philippine products to be applied to the payment of those bonds.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. At any rate, up to date the holders of those bonds would have the benefit of the exemption from the payment of tax.

Mr. BINGHAM. As have the holders of municipal and other bonds under the American flag.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. But they have had that benefit up to date. That is a fact, is it not, although the bonds bore a comparatively low rate of interest?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not see what that has to do with the question.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think it has some little to do with it—some little.

Mr. BINGHAM. They would not have been made tax exempt by the Congress except for the fact that Congress recognized that they were a moral obligation of the United States, issued under the aegis and protection of our Government.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Will the Senator permit me to dissent from the statement that the Government became morally or legally responsible? I do not think the Government did assume that obligation, legal or moral.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if the investors had thought that, they never would have bought a bond which yielded only 4½ per cent in a country 8,000 miles away.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Upon that particular point, I remind the Senator that the late Philander C. Knox, while Attorney General of the United States, issued an opinion in which he canvassed this entire problem, and came to the conclusion that we were under an unavoidable moral responsibility, although under no legal responsibility.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from California to be inquiring as to the possibility or probability or certainty of those owning bonds being paid. The Senator will find in the bill, if I recall the provision, a very specific statement to the effect that there will be a lien upon all of the revenues of the Philippine Islands for the payment of its outstanding obligations, whether those obligations have been incurred by municipalities or by the Philippine government.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct, Mr. President; but I still call to the Senator's attention the fact that if we get out too soon, obligations or no obligations, they can not be met if the country goes bankrupt.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I have been very much confused as to whether it is wise to give the additional time suggested, or whether, if we act, the action should not take place at once. That is a question that is uppermost in my mind now.

I assume that the time is proposed to be given for two reasons, one, in order to give time for those who have gone into the Philippines and made obligations, to adjust their affairs. I have considerable sympathy with that point of view. The other point would be a desire to permit the Philippine people to gradually take on all authority, so that when we get out, they will have had the discipline of all these years in preparing for self-government.

What is disturbing me is this, that we will gradually decrease our authority up to the time we go out, but we will be retaining responsibility just the same. They will have a plebiscite in order to determine whether they want independence. I do not assume that they would vote in the negative and say they did not want independence, but evidently that possibility is involved, or a plebiscite would not be provided for.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. FESS. Suppose they vote in the negative, indicating that they do not want independence. Our Government will have reached the point where it will have little power and all responsibility, and it would seem to me that we would be in a rather delicate situation at that time. What, then, would we do?

While I have always voted against any step toward independence, I am convinced that it is coming. I think it is inevitable, for many reasons. If we were considering our own interests, as we heretofore have not done, but have considered constantly the interests of the Filipinos, would it not be better for us to wash our hands of the responsibility at once, and, while giving up the power, remove all responsibility also? That is the question that is in my mind, and I am considerably confused over it. I am not satisfied with the plan the committee has reported.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I am sorry that neither of the authors of the bill, who devised the plan, with which I was somewhat reluctantly led to agree, is on the floor. I would prefer to have them defend their own bill, rather than to attempt to do so myself. As I suggested previously, I accepted and voted for the bill, and am trying to defend it, because it was the best bill we could get from a majority of the committee, and I think only two members finally voted against the time proposal. Therefore, Mr. President, I wish the Senator would send for the authors of the bill. There are perhaps three Senators who had more to do with it than any one else, and I do not see any one of the three on the floor at the present time.

May I say to the Senator, in partial answer to his question, that one of my reasons for wishing to hold on as long as possible is the present state of affairs in Asia. I fear that by relinquishing all authority in the Philippine Islands at an early date we will greatly complicate the situation in Asia, as was brought to our attention very forcibly by the testimony of the Secretary of State of the United States.

Mr. FESS. I thank the Senator. I had not intended, Mr. President, saying anything on this question, but it is coming up for a vote, and for once in my life I am going to explain my vote. It is largely because I have a record on this question of over 20 years, and it now appears that the inevitable result will be that my vote will not be in accordance with the way I have been voting all these years.

Ever since the Spanish-American War this question has been one of interest to me. When I came to the House of Representatives and the leader of the committee on committees asked me to what committees I would like to be assigned he named certain ones which were open, one being the Insular Affairs Committee. It appealed to me at once that I would rather be assigned to that committee than any other, largely because of the interest I had in the new movement of that day. It looked as though we were going into the colonization field outside of our own continent.

During those early years there was much agitation in the public mind as to what should be our policy. While it never strictly became a wholly political issue, there was a political phase in it.

There were certain courses open to us when these islands fell to us as the result of the war. One was to return them to Spain. But that seemed unthinkable, and there was no very strong urgency offered along that line.

Another suggestion was that there ought to be a protectorate established, either that we should accept that responsibility ourselves, or that a union should be established between us and Great Britain, France, and other countries which might join. That seemed to be altogether impracticable.

Another suggestion was that the islands and peoples might be transferred to some other government. That was an offensive suggestion, and did not get very far. I do not think any responsible citizens of this country thought much of the proposal.

We were therefore limited to the choice of two courses. One was to give the people their independence, and for the United States to get out and allow the Filipinos to work out their own problems. The other was to announce to the world that it would not be the purpose of the United States permanently to remain there, but that for the time being, in the interest of the Filipinos, the Government of the United States would retain sovereignty. The administration in Washington finally decided to follow the latter course.

There was considerable objection to that. The objection was offered that that was a field we had never entered before. A very large proportion of our people did not take strongly to the idea of the American Government's becoming a colonizing government, and only on the theory that our sovereignty was to be only temporary did we embark upon that course.

Personally it is rather offensive to me to suggest that the United States should hold permanently in subservience any people who, in the nature of the case, either geographical,



ethnological, or otherwise, would not become citizens of the United States. In other words, my idea would be that only such territory should be annexed to our country as that the inhabitants of which could ultimately become citizens of the United States with all the authority given to other citizens under the Constitution.

I have not been very much concerned about whether there is any constitutional authority to do what is being proposed. I rather think there is. That has not disturbed me very much. I have come to the conclusion that in the trend of affairs we are going to reach the place very soon where the policy of the Government of keeping the Philippines is going to be discontinued. Whether that is wise or not is an open question.

My concern about holding the Philippines all these years and the basis for my votes heretofore, when I served in another body and was associated with Manuel Quezon and knew his views on this subject and talked with him very frequently, has always been the doing of what appeared to me would be the best thing for the Filipinos with very little regard to whether it was of value to us, but rather in the fulfillment of what appeared to me to be a duty. It might not be an easy duty. It might be irksome. It might involve some liability. But if the duty was clear, it seemed to me we ought not to hesitate. It seemed to me that it was our duty to do what we have been doing all these years, to inaugurate a modern school system in the belief that in a generation of time progress would be made in that way; and if we should ever get out of the Philippines, it would have to come in that way, if we served the best interests of the Philippines. The same is true of road building and all other improvements. My concern in every vote I have cast in the 22 years has been in behalf of what I thought the best interests of the Filipinos themselves.

I had a fear at one time—and I confess that fear is not yet entirely eradicated—that the freedom of the Filipino, in the sense that we withdraw, might be the occasion for some other country to establish interests in the islands. I have always had that fear. I still have it in a degree. But there seems to be an assurance on the part of the Filipinos themselves and a great section of the people in our own country and statements have been made by other countries that that may not be a danger at all, although I am not entirely relieved of the fear of a possibility of a thing of that sort. That is one reason why I have hesitated to take any step to get out of the Philippines. I want it understood that I have regarded them always as a liability to the United States. It was not because of their value to us, but rather a duty that it seemed to me we owed. That is the basis for all the resistance I have ever offered to the idea of independence.

I have concluded, after these years of watching public sentiment and talking with people interested, that the policy is going to change; that a very large section of America feels that the mere idea of holding any people in any sort of subservience is offensive. From the very beginning that has been the feeling over a large section of our country, and I am of the opinion that the sentiment is growing.

Then there is another section of the people who have been more or less influenced by the thought that the work which has thus far been done has not been appreciated, and so why go on with a responsibility that involves some liability in the interest of persons who do not appreciate our viewpoint? I do not know how large that section is, but that element of thought exists in the country to-day.

Of course, there has always been the idea in certain groups that our Nation having become a world power, we ought to have some footing in the Orient. I do not know how strong that position is. While it is logical, I am not sure that going out of our course to maintain that position is justifiable. I have a dream that America is a world power and her influence must always be felt, not only for our position but for the good of the world, and as long as we do not involve ourselves in such a way that the duty carries a liability which is dangerous, that argument has had some force.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. HAWES. One of our greatest ambassadors to Japan was Mr. Cameron Forbes. He was also a commissioner in the Philippines. He assures us that we ought to get out and that there is no danger of a Japanese menace. Night before last Dr. Jacob Schurman, former president of Cornell and our former ambassador to China, addressed himself at great length to this subject, and he has no such apprehension, but believes we ought to get out. One of these gentlemen was our representative to the Chinese nation and the other to the Japanese nation, the two great oriental nations, and neither one of these gentlemen seems to have the slightest apprehension of trouble following our withdrawal.

Mr. FESS. I would say to the Senator that that phase of the argument has had some influence in my mind but not a controlling influence. I think the Senator is correct in the inference that it is not so serious now as it was at an earlier time. The Senator will agree with me that events over in the Orient, even those now going on, are somehow not reassuring.

I was trying to make a statement leading up to my conclusion which is quite the reverse of the position I have always taken heretofore—that it is inevitable that we shall have freedom of the Filipinos, upon whatever argument it may be based. The only question with me is whether it should not be as soon as possible rather than to tie our hands for a long period of time.

If it is definitely known we are going to grant their freedom, I am not so sure but what the complications may increase rather than decrease. I would hate to be caught in a position where we are being held responsible without power to do what ordinarily we would want to do. While all of my arguments and all of my instincts lead me to believe that everybody should have his own government, and that we should therefore hope to get out of the Philippines, I have concluded that is the course we should take. I am going to vote in that direction, although as to the time I would rather have it earlier, with no strings to it, than later, because I can see possible involvements in the bill as it is now written.

I am saying nothing about the things which are of interest to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and Senators from the West. I appreciate their position, but that is not the determining factor in my mind. I also appreciate the contention being offered by the people who are in the Philippines as to their investments. The only thing I can say is that they have known of this uncertainty just as we have known of it, and when they made their investments they certainly knew that Filipinos are what they are and that they may be freed at any time. Therefore, I can not think that that should be a determining factor in our vote, although I have a pronounced sympathy for that argument, and if there is anything we can do to give them some assurance I would be willing to do it. However, I think that ought not to deter us in the course we take. In view of the argument that has been offered all along that we are considering less our own interests than the interests of the Filipinos, I have concluded the time has come when we should consider our own interests as well as those of the Filipinos. For that reason I shall vote in some form to give the Filipinos their independence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING]?

Mr. CUTTING. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Earlier in the afternoon we had a colloquy respecting the length of time involved in the amendment which the Senator has now submitted, and I think we agreed that it approximated a program of 14 years. I now ask the Senator whether, under the terms of section 1 of the bill, it is not a fact that the actual length of time involved is exclusively within the control of the Philippine

Legislature itself, inasmuch as the legislature is completely a free agent in selecting the time and moment when it shall initiate the entire program?

Mr. CUTTING. Yes, Mr. President; I think the point the Senator raises is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If it is correct, then it follows that under the terms of the bill even as amended it would be entirely possible for the Philippine Legislature to continue a complete existing status quo as long as they felt like it. Is that correct?

Mr. CUTTING. I think that is correct. Would it be wise to insert, after the words "at such time as the Philippine Legislature may fix," the words "within one year"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is precisely the point I am bringing to the Senator's attention. It occurs to me it is perfectly futile and sterile for us to worry about the length of time involved so long as the bill stands in its existing language, because the control is completely and entirely out of our hands.

Mr. CUTTING. I think the point the Senator makes is good.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. We are now debating the length of time, proposing to reduce it from eight years to five years, and then to cut out the plebiscite. That question is not yet before us, as I understand it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The immediate question before the Senate is the 5-year amendment, and the point I make is that it makes no difference whether we make it 5 or 10 or 20 years because under the terms of the bill the actual time is exclusively within the control of the Filipinos themselves. Certainly it should be changed if there is a purpose to effect the will of the Congress.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I think the point is very well taken. If it is agreeable to my various colleagues on the committee, I should like to insert after the third line the words "within one year after the enactment of this act," and make that a part of the amendment when I shall submit it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if we have about concluded our arguments and are about to reach a vote, I want to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I do not want to do so if any one else wishes to make a speech. I am in hopes that we may get a vote.

Mr. BORAH. That is a good idea; but is this an amendment to—

Mr. LONG. It is an amendment that strikes out eight years, as provided in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], and makes it five years. That is the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Iowa is not in the Chamber, is he?

Mr. LONG. No, sir; he does not appear to be here at present.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to have a quorum called.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] would both like to be present at this time.

Mr. BORAH. I wish to say before the quorum is called that if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] cutting the intervening period before independence from eight years to five years should be adopted, we would still have the difficulties with reference to that amendment which were pointed out yesterday, in that it conflicts with many of the provisions of the Senate bill. I was going to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he offer his 5-year limitation to the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico, and then we would have an opportunity to limit the period without interfering with the other provisions of the Senate bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LONG. It looks as if we are going to have more argument, and so there is no need of having a quorum call at the moment.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Idaho addressed himself to the Senator from Iowa, and I thought he would like his presence, but if the Senator from Louisiana wishes to speak, I shall withhold the suggestion.

Mr. LONG. Very well; I yield for a quorum.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question.

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico, who is entirely familiar with all the provisions of the bill, whether, in view of the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, if offered to the new amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, would be consistent with the other provisions of the new amendment of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CUTTING. I am rather doubtful about that, Mr. President. I have not had a chance to go over the amendment of the Senator from Iowa in detail, and I am not sure that it includes the various provisions which are in the bill as it came from the Senate committee, namely, the limitation of imports, the graduated tax, and the plebiscite.

Mr. FESS. I think not.

Mr. CUTTING. It would have no bearing on my amendment unless my amendment were changed.

Mr. LONG. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Costigan	Hull	Reynolds
Austin	Couzens	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Bailey	Cutting	Kean	Robinson, Ind.
Bankhead	Dale	Kendrick	Schall
Barkley	Dickinson	Keyes	Schuyler
Bingham	Dill	King	Sheppard
Black	Fess	La Follette	Shipstead
Blaire	Frazier	Logan	Shortridge
Borah	George	Long	Smoot
Bratton	Glass	McGill	Stelwer
Broussard	Glenn	McKellar	Swanson
Bulkeley	Goldsborough	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gore	Metcalf	Townsend
Byrnes	Grammer	Moses	Trammell
Capper	Hale	Neely	Tydings
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Carey	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Cohen	Hatfield	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Coolidge	Hayden	Pittman	Watson
Copeland	Howell	Reed	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Iowa. When my friend from Oregon thought the Senator from Iowa should be called into the Chamber, I was suggesting that we have debated this Philippine time limit now for nearly three days. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] has offered an amendment to cut the time down to eight years and the Senator from Iowa has moved to amend by striking out "eight years" and making it "five years." The committee sleeps overnight and comes back with a proposal to make the time 11 years. It looks like we are not making any progress in the matter, and I was hoping we could have a vote on it. I think out of 96 Senators we have had 96 speeches, although not every Senator, of course, has spoken on the question. I was hoping, however, that we could vote on the proposition of the Senator from Iowa providing a 5-year limitation. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the vote would come first on that proposal, then on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to make it eight years, and then let the committee offer the amendment they have prepared, and get through with it. We are not going to get any bill at all here unless we take some action.



It is perfectly clear to my mind from the discussion which we have had that if we are going to get any such thing as actual freedom for the Filipinos we are going to have to be definite about it in this Congress, and we are going to have to get some kind of a bill started. I think that, above all things, we ought to eliminate the provision for a second plebiscite; but if a majority want to let it remain in this bill, very well. However, let us vote and get this measure started to conference. The poor Filipinos are not going to be free for 40 years the way we are going along now. There are about four suggestions now pending affecting the one item of the time limitation. I hope we can get to a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from Louisiana had yielded the floor in order that a vote might be taken.

Mr. LONG. I had yielded for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the Senator from Louisiana, then, to yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, I am entirely sympathetic with the thought expressed by the Senator from Louisiana; he is entirely correct; but there is one aspect of this matter which we should consider for a moment.

I do not think we can object that those American citizens who have a vital, direct interest shall present their interest on the floor of the Senate. We have five cane-sugar States that have what might be called a selfish interest. We have also 17 beet-sugar States, all vitally interested in this subject. Then we have the Pacific Coast States very greatly concerned in the matter of immigration.

Mr. President, I do not believe there are five Senators here who do not favor independence in some form. Every witness before the House committee, every witness before the Senate committee, Army officers, Navy officers, planters, union labor, and all agree that a condition of uncertainty exists which should be settled by this Congress.

What is the situation? We have until March to pass a bill. If a proper bill is not passed and signed meanwhile some of these gentlemen will find themselves mistaken in having believed that the next Congress, if called in special session, will take up the Philippine question. I am directing this observation to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Dickinson], who, I know, is trying to help the farmers of his State. I think he is right about it.

If during the present session we do not pass some legislation which will be signed, it is a futile gesture, and three years of investigation will have been in vain. I can not look into the future; but I can prophesy, I can guess, that at a special session of Congress, with the multitude of subjects coming before it, the Philippine question would be pushed aside, which would mean that it could not come up for another year. If it should then take as long to bring the matter to a vote as it has taken this time, it will be two years before the question in which the American farmer is vitally interested can be brought upon the floor of the Senate.

Take, for instance, the matter of sugar: To-day the free imports of sugar from the Philippines total 850,000 tons. Next year we know such imports will be 1,023,000 tons. We know, or we can calculate with some accuracy, that two years from now they will be 1,500,000 tons—and that should be a matter of great concern to the American farmer, as it is also a matter of great concern to the Philippines, making the solution of the problem more difficult for both.

The subject now before us is this:

The Senator from Louisiana proposes independence in eight years. We know that if that amendment shall be adopted the entire philosophy of graduated tariff in the Senate bill will be destroyed. The Senator from Iowa now suggests that that time be shortened to five years. May I

say that it was the unanimous opinion, I believe, in the House that the interim should be eight years? May I add that I do not believe there were more than two members of the Senate committee who favored a 5-year period or a period less than that?

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in an effort to arrive at a solution, asked the members of the committee if they had any suggestions to make. Ably assisted by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], they arrived at what we considered a very proper compromise—that is to say, the limitation of imports is to run for a period of 7 years, and a progressive increase in the tariff for an additional period of 5 years, making a total transitional period of 12 years. That is within 4 years of the period set by the House; and the processes to be followed could not, I think, delay the final solution of this question further than 13½ years. So we are very close as to that point; but we are not close as to another. If the motion of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is carried, it will have to be followed by a series of amendments, and the whole philosophy of the Senate bill will then have been abandoned.

With the House proposing a limitation continuously for eight years, and with the Senate adopting a combination of the two arrangements, this matter could go to conference and be adjusted there. I feel sure that it can be so adjusted that neither the Filipinos nor American interests will be injured. If, however, the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is approved by a vote of the Senate, then all hope of compromise, of reconciliation, and of preserving the philosophy of our bill will be blasted.

We are rather close as to the matter of time; but I hope both of these amendments will be defeated.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. LONG. Vote!

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, just one word before the vote is taken.

As I said before, I was for immediate independence, and have been for years. When the Hawes-Cutting bill came before our committee, after hearing the economic conditions, in order to agree on something I yielded to a period of five years, which we had agreed upon once. Then there was a reconsideration; but thereafter I held on to the last vote taken in the committee, and always advocated five years.

I offered this amendment, making the time eight years, after consulting a number of those who wanted a shorter period. I found that few wanted less than five years, a great many wanted five years, and some said they believed the time ought to be a little longer. So I made it eight years in order to try to meet the views of a number of Senators who were interested and to meet the period prescribed by the House.

I have not changed my views about the 5-year period; and in view of the fact that my amendment proposes eight years, I thought I would make this explanation, as I intend to vote for my amendment restricted to five years. Thereafter I shall urge the adoption of my amendment, if the 5-year period is not agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I ask now for a vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. I will yield to the junior Senator from Florida for a moment. Does the Senator want the floor in his own right?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I want the floor in my own right.

Mr. LONG. Then I want to keep it in my own right. I do not want to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. If we are going to have speeches, I am going to make one myself.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The Senator from Louisiana has occupied most of the time for two or three days, and now he objects to some of the rest of us occupying a few minutes. I am going to have a few minutes before this matter is settled, regardless of the Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not intend to keep the Senator from Florida from having the floor. I have sat here and listened to speeches for two days, and now I am going to speak myself. If we can not get a vote on this floor, there is nobody that the Senate had better listen to than myself, and I see no reason why we have to go all over the United States to get anybody else.

I have heard all the arguments that have been made. I have sat here and listened to everybody. I am in position to give the Senate the counsel of every man who has spoken for two days; and I am the only man who has been here who can give you a composite opinion from having listened to every speech that has been made here in the last 48 hours or such a matter.

All we are quibbling about is whether the time is going to be 5 years, 8 years, 11 years, or 17 years. I want to get some kind of a bill out of the Senate. I was in conference yesterday. While I did not exactly agree 100 per cent with the compromise that has been offered in the form of an amendment, yet it is satisfactory to me, and I have no quarrel with it if that is the best we can get.

That is a pretty good compromise. I would rather see the time fixed at 5 years; I would rather see it fixed at 8 years; but 11 years is a pretty good compromise. At least it has to go to conference, and there are still some things to be ironed out.

Mr. President, this is the 14th day of December. We are far from reaching anything like a solution or a vote on the Philippine question. No doubt Senators want to consider it in many, many more respects, as to whether the time is going to be 5 years, or 8 years, or 11 years. Probably it will take some Senators several days more to make up their minds about it. It has taken me a week, and probably it will take somebody else another week. I believe probably the Senators can make up their minds about it more from listening to me for a little while longer. At this time, however, I am going to yield the floor; but I expect to speak at great length, something like seven or eight hours, beginning at some time this evening, if we do not reach a vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I had not contemplated occupying more than about three or four minutes. I suppose I owe an apology to my good friend from Louisiana for not going around and asking his permission to take two or three minutes on this important subject, on which he has occupied probably two or three hours in the last several days.

In my 16 years of service in the Senate I have observed a good many very generous Senators of his character. After occupying all the time they want to occupy on a subject, they then begin to call "Vote! Vote!" and do not want anybody else to have a word to say. I am a little surprised that my able and distinguished friend from Louisiana should do a thing of that character, with his ability and his ingenuity in promoting legislation. Such a policy does not expedite legislation.

All I wish to say is that I am in favor of the independence of the Philippines. As long as five or six years ago I was favorable to their immediate independence, and not to an installment, long-drawn-out proposition that would take years and years for its accomplishment. I think that if the condition of the Philippines justifies legislation upon the subject there is no reason why the legislation should be so framed and formulated that they will be some 12, 16, or 17 years in acquiring their independence.

Believing in the policy, believing it to their interest and for the interest of our country and of agriculture in America

and in my own State, I am going to support the shorter period of five years instead of eight.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. HAWES and Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Couzens	Hull	Robinson, Ark.
Austin	Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Bailey	Dale	Kendrick	Schall
Bankhead	Davis	Keyes	Schuyler
Barkley	Dickinson	King	Sheppard
Bingham	Dill	La Follette	Shipstead
Black	Fess	Logan	Shortridge
Blaine	Frazier	Long	Smoot
Borah	George	McGill	Steiwer
Bratton	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Glenn	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Byrnes	Grammer	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Wagner
Carey	Harrison	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Cohen	Hastings	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hatfield	Patterson	Watson
Coolidge	Hawes	Pittman	White
Copeland	Hayden	Reed	
Costigan	Howell	Reynolds	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] moves to amend the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], in line 2, by striking out "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "five," so that the amendment would read:

SEC. 9. (a) On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of five years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COPELAND (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lewis]. Not knowing how that Senator would vote, I shall withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. STEIWER (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON], who is absent. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. BORAH (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho was called). I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS of Idaho] on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is absent from the Senate. I have been unable to secure a transfer of my pair, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when Mr. WHEELER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:



The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]; and

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. KING. I have a general pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLENN. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. In his absence from the Chamber I am not at liberty to vote. If I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 38, as follows:

## YEAS—37

Bankhead	Costigan	Long	Shipstead
Black	Couzens	McGill	Shortridge
Borah	Davis	Moses	Smoot
Broussard	Dickinson	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Dill	Nye	Townsend
Byrnes	Fess	Reynolds	Trammell
Capper	Frazier	Robinson, Ind.	White
Carey	George	Schall	
Cohen	Hatfield	Schuyler	
Connally	Howell	Sheppard	

## NAYS—38

Ashurst	Glass	Johnson	Pittman
Austin	Goldsborough	Kendrick	Reed
Bailey	Gore	Keyes	Robinson, Ark.
Barkley	Grammer	La Follette	Tydings
Bingham	Hale	Logan	Vandenberg
Blaine	Harrison	McKellar	Wagner
Bulkeley	Hastings	Metcalf	Walsh, Mass.
Coolidge	Hawes	Neely	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Hayden	Oddie	
Dale	Hull	Patterson	

## NOT VOTING—21

Barbour	Glenn	Norris	Walcott
Bratton	Hebert	Smith	Watson
Brookhart	Kean	Stelwer	Wheeler
Caraway	King	Stephens	
Copeland	Lewis	Swanson	
Fletcher	McNary	Thomas, Idaho	

So Mr. DICKINSON's amendment to Mr. BROUSSARD's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD].

Mr. BROUSSARD. Upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, let the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37 of the committee amendment, strike out all after line 7 to and including the word "report" in line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 9. (a) On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of eight years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act.

So as to read:

Sec. 9. (a) On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of eight years from the date of the inauguration of the new government under the constitution provided for in this act the President of the United States shall withdraw and surrender all right of possession, supervision, jurisdiction, control, or sovereignty then existing and exercised by the United States in and over the territory and people of the Philippine Islands and, on behalf of the United States, shall recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation and acknowledge the authority and control over the same of the government instituted by the people thereof under the constitution then in force: *Provided*, That the constitution has been previously amended to include the following provisions:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COPELAND (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. GLENN (when his name was called). Repeating my previous announcement relative to my pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], I refrain from voting. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Repeating my former statement, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my general pair and transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY];

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT] with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART].

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 38, as follows:

## YEAS—40

Bankhead	Couzens	King	Schall
Black	Davis	Long	Schuyler
Broussard	Dickinson	McGill	Sheppard
Bulow	Dill	Moses	Shipstead
Byrnes	Frazier	Neely	Shortridge
Capper	George	Norbeck	Smoot
Carey	Hatfield	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Cohen	Howell	Oddie	Townsend
Connally	Kendrick	Reynolds	Trammell
Costigan	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	White

## NAYS—38

Ashurst	Cutting	Hawes	Reed
Austin	Dale	Hayden	Robinson, Ark.
Bailey	Fess	Hull	Stelwer
Barkley	Glass	Johnson	Tydings
Bingham	Goldsborough	La Follette	Vandenberg
Blaine	Gore	Logan	Wagner
Borah	Grammer	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Bratton	Hale	Metcalf	Walsh, Mont.
Bulkeley	Harrison	Patterson	
Coolidge	Hastings	Pittman	

## NOT VOTING—18

Barbour	Glenn	Norris	Walcott
Brookhart	Hebert	Smith	Watson
Caraway	Kean	Stephens	Wheeler
Copeland	Lewis	Swanson	
Fletcher	McNary	Thomas, Idaho	

So Mr. BROUSSARD's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROUSSARD obtained the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is it the purpose of the Senator from Louisiana to make any effort to amend the bill so as to adopt the philosophy of the committee with regard to the graduated scale of what would amount to import taxes or export taxes?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I had intended that certain features of the bill should be eliminated in order to strike from the bill those provisions relating to the ninth year, and so on to the end of the time, where the taxes are imposed in a progressive step-up.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thought the Senator might be willing to amend the bill so as to include that in his 8-year-period provision.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have no intention of doing so.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the Senator has no intention of doing so, and the Senate follows the theory of his amendment, may I take the Senator's time to suggest that that will then wipe out any possibility of the Filipinos being able to secure the money needed to pay off the interest and principal of the bonds which have been issued by them and which amount to many millions of dollars.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield the floor for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation now as I see it is this: We have adopted the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD], which in effect is the adoption of the bill as passed by the House. In other words, we take a paragraph from the House bill which provides for 8-year limitations on imports from the Philippine Islands and for absolute independence after the eighth year. That is the House bill. The language is offered directly from the House bill. Instead of going to work now and attempting to strike out the unnecessary clauses of the Senate bill and possibly not getting all of them, it seems to me the best thing we can do, since the Senate has so voted, is simply to disagree to the original amendment. There is an amendment pending now which is that the Senate committee text be substituted for the House bill. We are proceeding under the House title and number, but with the Senate committee text, and a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the Senate bill. The Senate bill has now been destroyed by the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. Therefore I move that the Senate disagree to the committee amendment substituting the Senate bill for the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that a negative vote would accomplish what he wants.

Mr. PITTMAN. I call for a vote on that motion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KING. If the motion submitted by the Senator from Nevada should prevail, would that preclude offering a substitute for the measure which would then be before the Senate for consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If it is not the desire of the Senator from Nevada to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill, a negative vote on that proposal would accomplish what the Senator from Nevada desires.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have made the motion. I move that the Senate disagree to the committee amendment proposing to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill. I submit that as a motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the vote on the amendment to substitute the Senate committee text for the text of the House bill, if the Senate committee amendment is voted down, does not the House language still remain open for amendment on the floor of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. As I understand it, the House bill does not contain the agricultural limitations which the Senate committee bill contains.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; it is exactly the same, as I recall it.

Mr. LONG. Then we would have to go through the bill again cutting down the quantities?

Mr. PITTMAN. We would have to do that anyway on a motion to reconsider, so I suggested that instead of having the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] go through the bill and move to strike out what is now dead, we might as well start work on the House text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has put the Chair in a state of some confusion by making his motion, an affirmative vote on which would accomplish exactly what a negative vote would accomplish on the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. PITTMAN. I withdraw my motion and move to table the amendment offered by the committee substituting the Senate bill for the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senate bill was substituted for the House bill by unanimous consent.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. That question was asked of the then occupant of the chair the other day, and was answered in the negative, that the substitution had not been made by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, then, will put the motion made by the Senator from Nevada to table the amendment proposed by the Senate committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator's motion to table the committee amendment?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the affirmative of that motion should prevail, and the motion should be adopted, would not that carry with it the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not, and the question is not debatable, the Chair will state to the Senator. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. If the committee amendment should be tabled, could it not subsequently be called up again, thus permitting a rehash of the debate we have had?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to table does not carry the bill with it. The bill will still be before the Senate.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I want to understand what the situation is. If the motion should prevail, and the committee amendment should be tabled, I should like to know if it would not be subject to be called up again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would remain on the table until taken up by a proper motion.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Well, it could be taken up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; by agreeing to a motion to reconsider.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And that would revive all these same questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the motion to table the Senate committee amendment shall be carried, may not any Member upon the floor offer the same provisions as an amendment to the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that he may.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then what would be accomplished by now tabling the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the pending question is not debatable.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Is not this the parliamentary situation: If the Senate committee amendment, which was the Senate bill which has now been changed by a vote to conform to the House bill, is tabled, then no amendment of the same effect can be received by this body?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, certainly if the Senate committee amendment to the House bill is tabled, that is a final disposition of the Senate committee amendment, and the only way it can be revived is by a reconsideration of the vote by which it was tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a further comment upon the parliamentary situation. A vote to table the pending amendment would not be the same thing as a direct yea-and-nay vote on the amendment itself. If we voted on the Senate committee amendment, and defeated it, it could not be offered again in the same terms, although it might be offered with slight changes. So simply to table the pending amendment, it occurs to me, is



not tantamount to its defeat by a yea-and-nay vote so as to preclude the possibility of offering another amendment of the same nature.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, a vote to table a bill or an amendment is the most decisive way of defeating it, because it precludes debate and terminates the issue. If the Senate votes to table the Senate committee amendment, the only way it can be revived is by a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. BROUSSARD. There comes, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that debate on this question is entirely out of order.

Mr. BROUSSARD. A parliamentary inquiry, then, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. If the action of the Senate should be reconsidered, then, further amendments could be offered to the amendment later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first question is on the motion made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

Mr. PITTMAN. In view of the motion of the Senator from Arkansas, I withdraw the motion to table, if the Senate desires to vote on the question of reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana was agreed to.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that when Senators voted for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana they thought that it involved but one thing, namely, the element of time. That is not correct. The adoption of that amendment makes it impossible for the Senate bill to go to conference; it negatives absolutely the philosophy of the Senate bill.

I am sure that some Senators were absent during the discussion yesterday, when the Senator from Idaho asked if something could not be done to shorten the time, and are not aware that members of the committee and other Senators on the floor prepared a substitute which would prolong the transitional period only two years beyond that provided in the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana.

But by the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana the entire philosophy of the Senate bill is destroyed, and we are estopped from taking it to conference. So the members of the committee would much prefer, if the Senate wants to adopt the philosophy of the House bill, to accept everything the House bill provides.

I am not saying this in a spirit of impatience; but some Senators do not understand, because they were not here, that in the House bill there is a straight limitation for a period of years while in the Senate bill there is also a straight limitation for a period of years plus a tariff by steps; and they do not understand, perhaps, that an agreement was entered into yesterday to present—and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] is prepared to present upon the defeat, if that be possible, of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana—an entirely new proposition, which will bring the time for Philippine independence to within two years of the limitation provided in the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HAWES. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator does not, I think, want to stand the statement he has just made that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana the bill can not go to conference, when, as a matter of fact, the bill is still open to amendment and, no doubt, will be amended.

Mr. HAWES. I mean exactly what I say, that the entire philosophy of the bill as proposed by the Senate committee is destroyed.

Mr. DILL. That may be true, but the bill would still go to conference.

Mr. HAWES. It would go to conference on other points but not on this vital point.

Mr. DILL. We do not want it to go to conference, so far as the 8-year limitation is concerned.

Mr. HAWES. I am not talking about the 8-year limitation; I am talking about two different plans, one of which is a straight limitation and the other of which is partly a limitation and partly a tariff-step arrangement for a period of years.

Mr. KING obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. With the indulgence of the Senator having the floor, I wish to say that I am not entitled, under the rules of the Senate, to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] was agreed to. I am morally sure if that point is not now in the mind of some Senator that it will be, and, in any event, I wish to conform to the rules. However, I do feel that some Members of the Senate did not fully understand the effect of the vote by which that amendment was agreed to, and I feel that some one who did vote with the prevailing side ought to give the Senate an opportunity to reconsider its action.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. KING. Whenever the Senator from Arkansas concludes, I will resume the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think I have said all that it is proper for me to say. May I add, however, before taking my seat, that I believe we ought to get the Senate bill into conference, and I believe that the tentative agreement that was reached by some Members of the Senate to reduce the time ought to be incorporated in the bill so that the conferees may have an opportunity of working out the details.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KING. I have the floor and I desire to speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I want to understand the situation.

Mr. KING. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the motion of the Senator from Arkansas now before the Senate?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. No; I am not entitled to make the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that it may get before the Senate, as one who voted in the negative, may I make the motion, namely, to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana was adopted?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Maryland for the purpose of permitting him to submit the motion which he has just indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Maryland voted on the same side as did the Senator from Arkansas, in which case he is not permitted to make the motion.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, pending the determination of the question as to who is eligible to submit the motion, I shall occupy the floor. The statement made by the Senator from Missouri is perhaps technically correct. I think, however, the discussion of the pending bill has demonstrated that a majority of the Senators do not favor some of its provisions, and particularly those which extend the period of control over the Philippine Islands for 17 to 20 years, and call for a plebiscite after such period and before the sovereignty of the United States is to be withdrawn. The vote just taken upon the amendment offered by the Senator

from Iowa indicated, I think, quite conclusively that a majority of the Senate favor the granting of independence to the Philippines at the expiration of five years. At any rate, it was an expression of dissatisfaction with important provisions of the bill. The vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] is also indicative of the desire of the Senate to grant independence and to bring about that result within a much shorter period than that provided in the bill before us.

Mr. President, it is apparent that the plebiscite provision of the Hawes-Cutting bill does not have the support of many Senators. Indeed, there has been great opposition exhibited toward that provision during the debate. Undoubtedly opposition to this feature of the pending measure is in part responsible for the majority votes taken upon the motion of the Senator from Iowa and upon the motion submitted by the Senator from Louisiana. The view is entertained by many Senators that if the United States is to control the Philippine Islands for a period of from 17 to 20 years it will be difficult at the end of that period to secure Philippine independence. It is believed that influences and forces will be at work during the intervening period hostile to independence. It has been suggested repeatedly that additional foreign capital would be invested in the Philippine Islands and that industries there existing will be expanded and other industries developed. This would result, it is believed, in strengthening economic ties between the United States and the Philippines which would make more difficult the attainment of independence.

It is quite natural that persons having large interests in the Philippines would oppose the withdrawal of American sovereignty, provided that financial benefits would result from the Philippine Islands remaining under the flag of the United States. As Senators know, there are American, Spanish, and Chinese investments in the Philippines, and it is quite likely that if the United States is to retain its sovereignty over the islands for 19 or 20 years, additional foreign capital will seek investment in the Philippines. It is obvious that large holdings by foreign capital would prove an obstruction to independence, and it is to be expected that there would be strong influence enlisted to frustrate complete and absolute independence. It is known that large foreign investments in Cuba exercise considerable influence in that country, not only in financial circles but among the mass of the people. Those who employ large numbers of people influence, whether they will or not, their employees. In the Philippine Islands there are several million people employed in the sugar business and in the production of sugarcane. Undoubtedly their attitude toward independence would be influenced by the position of their employers. Perhaps some Filipinos with large interests would at the end of 19 or 20 years be inclined to support policies calling for the retention by the United States of its authority over the Philippines.

It is certain that during the intervening period between the inauguration of the autonomous government provided for under the bill, and the final plebiscite, there would be influences at work, and persistent agitation, all directed towards neutralizing or diluting the sentiment in favor of independence, and developing fears and apprehensions calculated to encourage sentiment in favor of the maintenance of control of the United States over the Philippines. I think it is a serious mistake to surround the question with so many uncertainties. The Filipinos have been asking for their independence for more than a quarter of a century. They opposed the United States taking over the control of their country and they have never abated their determination to achieve independence.

Ever since our Government asserted jurisdiction and authority over the Philippines there has been a persistent propaganda by many Americans in favor of annexation or the postponement of independence to an indefinite if not remote period. It is well known that forces have been at work for many years to weaken the sentiment in the Philippines in favor of absolute and complete independence. Business organizations in the United States have been ac-

tively engaged in creating sentiment hostile to independence. The economic and political conditions in the islands have been misrepresented and efforts made to convince the American people that the Filipinos were wholly incapable of governing themselves or of maintaining an independent government. Perhaps no people have been so misrepresented as the Filipinos. Many propagandists against independence have justified their position upon the pretext that if the sovereignty of the United States were withdrawn the Philippine Islands would soon fall a prey to some aggressive and imperialistic power. Japan not infrequently has been referred to as a nation which would promptly seize the islands when the authority of the United States was withdrawn. Notwithstanding the persistent propaganda to which I have referred, the Filipinos have resolutely adhered to their desire for independence. Neither threats nor cajolery have in the slightest degree diminished their desire for freedom. They have been realists while contending for their ideals; they have appreciated the difficulties and hazards to which independence would expose them; they have counted the cost and have determined that the prize which they sought—*independence, liberty, and the right to govern themselves*—was compensation for whatever dangers or difficulties they might be called upon to encounter.

They have relied upon the promises made that they should have independence. If it should be denied them, they would regard our Government as guilty of perfidy and dishonor. If independence was now denied them and they were to be compelled to continue in a condition of suspense or of uncertainty, a situation would develop disadvantageous to the Filipinos, not only economically but politically. They believed, as did others familiar with the question, that the longer independence is denied the more difficult will it be to bring about a severance of the ties binding the two countries. Moreover, it is certain that new problems would arise growing out of this abnormal and unnatural relation—problems which might impair the peace and the economic welfare of the Filipinos and create conditions unfavorable to the United States. The reasons why independence should be granted are unanswerable. The opposition to independence rests upon unsound and unjust foundations. I wish that we had before us a measure that would commend the approval of the Filipinos and enable them to place upon the brow of their country the crown of independence.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield the floor.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I simply want to make a suggestion.

Last night, after the long discussion over the time element, the committee, after due deliberation, came in here and offered certain amendments that do materially reduce the time.

I do not believe the time has been reduced to a point where it is acceptable to the majority of the Senate. I do not believe there is an objection here as to the philosophy of the bill of the Senate or a preference shown for the theory set out in the bill of the House; but there is a distinct decision here that indicates that the majority of the Senate want a shorter time.

If the committee want to present this matter in a way that is understandable, it seems to me it would be a very easy matter for them to take their amendment and cut off about five or six years from each one of those suggestions, and they will have the philosophy retained. Then the reduction in tonnage can be worked out in a way that will suit everybody, and we will have a bill here that will pass the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I was just mentioning that matter to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hawes]. If they will cut down on their quantities—that is, if they will recognize to some reasonable extent the reductions which we have made here by amendment in the quantity of sugar and in the quantity of coconut oil and reduce the time limit somewhat more or less in tune with the way the Senate feels—there is no reason



why some of us might not make that motion and retain the philosophy of the Senate bill. That could be done.

Mr. DICKINSON. It is my hope that in view of the vote of the Senate, possibly the committee would consider the question of whether further time reductions would not be made, other than that suggested in the amendment I offered this morning.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Is it the Senator's view that the so-called philosophy of this bill, whatever that philosophy may be, should be imported into a bill where the restriction was for five years?

Mr. DICKINSON. That is correct.

Mr. KING. Then, the Senator's view is that we should impose upon the Filipinos a limitation of five years; that is to say, that we should let them have their independence in five years, but, starting immediately, there should be a tariff imposed upon imports from the Philippines to the United States?

Mr. DICKINSON. No; I think there ought to be a graduated tariff beginning after a year or two years, or, if not a graduated tariff, then a graduated reduction in the imports for the period of time; and I am opposed to the plebiscite at the end of the probationary period.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator in his time, if he will pardon me, that there are some of us who are opposed to the so-called philosophy under which the Government of the United States may impose upon the Filipinos, or may impose upon the people of Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or Alaska, a tariff so long as those Territories and their people remain under the flag. If that is the philosophy for which the Senator is contending, I beg to register my dissent therefrom.

Mr. DICKINSON. I am not contending for that philosophy, because the understanding I have here is that there shall be practically a declaration of independence at the time the Legislature of the Philippines accepts the terms of the bill. From then on we would be dealing with a country that had taken the first step toward the severance of its relations with our own country.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Utah that the philosophy of the bill, which has been referred to repeatedly by the Senator from New Mexico, who had a great deal to do with drafting it, did not include placing a tariff on Philippine products. It included, as the Senator will remember, placing an export duty to be collected by the Filipinos to be applied to paying off their bonded indebtedness. The provision which the Senate has adopted, under the motion of the Senator from Louisiana, does away with any such period of gradual taxation or any such export duties at all, and, of course, does away with the plebiscite at the end of the period, putting the plebiscite at the beginning of the period.

Mr. KING. May I say that I think that is less objectionable than a direct tariff. Nevertheless, a rose may smell just as sweet or just as foul under one name as another. While there is a distinction, nevertheless, to me both are objectionable.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] was adopted be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota moves a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LONG. Just a moment; we are moving so fast.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event the motion of the Senator from South Dakota is agreed to, if the matter is reconsidered and the Broussard amendment is voted down, an amendment will immediately be offered providing for a

period of time of seven years, then five years, and progressive restrictions, and then a plebiscite. May I point out to the Senator from Iowa that if he thinks that is too long a time that amendment will be subject to amendment so that we can get the sense of the Senate as to whether they want a 10-year period, a 5-year period, or a 15-year period. We will all have a chance to record the thing in which we believe if we vote the Broussard amendment down and have the Cutting amendment offered.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DICKINSON. I think the Senate has already expressed itself with reference to the 18-year period, with reference to the 5-year period, and with reference to the 8-year period. I do not believe that on the floor of the Senate we are going to be able to adjust these time limits in the bill to a point where we will get good legislation. I should much prefer that the bill be recommitted to the committee with instructions to work it out along the lines suggested.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from New Mexico will provide a 7-year period, then five years of progressive tariff, and then a plebiscite. When that amendment comes before the Senate it will be in order, for example, to strike out the 7-year period of no tariffs and cut it down to 4 years, and to cut down the 5-year progressive tariff to 2 years; in other words, to make the time limit whatever the Senate wants it made. Until we get that amendment before the Senate, however, there is no way of ascertaining just what the Senate wants, because under the Broussard amendment it is forced to take a 7-year proposition and nothing else. If, however, we vote down the Broussard amendment, then the Cutting amendment will be offered, and we can amend that to compress independence within such time limits as the Senate may fix.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to move a substitute for the motion to reconsider, if it is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would not be in order.

Mr. LONG. Very well. Then I want to make this suggestion:

As the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] says, it is going to do no good to undertake to rewrite this bill on the floor as we now have it. A vote to reconsider this amendment simply means opening up the situation again. If we change it, the chances are that we will still retain the Broussard amendment. I believe the sentiment of the Senate is to restrict this period to around eight years.

If it were nearer 5 o'clock, I should be nearer in order in making my suggestion. What I think we ought to do is this:

I have been laboring trying to get a compromise so that we could get a Philippine independence bill. Why? I think the Broussard amendment is the amendment we ought to pass. I think it is sound. I think the 5-year period is still better; but I have been laboring here trying to get an amendment, trying to get a bill, in order that we might begin to put some restrictions on the imports of sugar.

I want to suggest to the Senator from South Dakota that the motion to reconsider be withheld at this time. I also want to ask whoever has labored with the Senator from South Dakota to adopt that course.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the parliamentary situation, if the motion of the Senator from South Dakota is agreed to, and the Broussard amendment is brought up again, and upon a vote the Broussard amendment is voted

down, the Senate will have an opportunity, in voting upon and offering amendments to the Cutting amendment, to cut down the Cutting amendment to 10 years, 7 years, 12 years, or whatever length of time it desires, without changing the philosophy of the committee bill or amendment. Until the Broussard amendment is voted down, however, it will be impossible to get before the Senate any amendment which will keep the philosophy of the committee amendment in the bill.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. The Senator means, by the philosophy of the committee amendment, the plebiscite? Is not that what the Senator means?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, no; let me explain once more.

Mr. DILL. I have not seen anything else in it that is important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield further, and to whom?

Mr. LONG. I yield to either the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Cutting amendment provides a period of seven years with no tariffs, then a period of five years with a progressive tariff each year, and then a plebiscite.

Mr. DILL. Of course, if the Senator is going to have a total of 12 years, that is another matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; the Senator will not let me finish, and he will not listen when I am trying to explain the matter to him.

If we get the Cutting amendment before the Senate with a 7-year and a 5-year provision, making 12 years in all, amendments will then be in order to change 7 to 5, and to change 5 to 3, so that Philippine independence would then be granted within 10 years if the Senate wants to vote 10 years in the Cutting amendment, or 5 years, or 15 years; but whatever time we fix in the amendment would permit the philosophy of the committee bill to be retained and we could fix the time limit.

Mr. DILL. Now, we have the Senator's philosophy, namely, that he wants a chance to vote on the 12 years, and then that we could reduce it to 8 years if we want to. We already have it reduced to eight years. Therefore, why go into that?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; if the Senator will bear with me one moment longer; he has not understood what I explained.

Mr. DILL. Yes; I understood what the Senator explained. I understand what he means.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I raise a point of order. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. It is contrary to the rules of the Senate for a Senator having the floor to yield for a speech, or for any other purpose than a question.

Mr. LONG. All right; then I will stay within that, if the Senator makes the point of order.

Mr. PITTMAN. I make that point of order. I think each Senator should take the floor in his own time.

Mr. LONG. All right. I will yield the floor very soon, so that we can have the thing out ad libitum; but I want to make a suggestion, Mr. President:

With due regard to my friends from Maryland and from Missouri, when we talk about "compromise" we can get all the concessions we want on our side, but apparently we can not get any concessions from the proponents of this amendment. We might as well keep the Broussard bill here unless we are going to agree that we are going to strike out the plebiscite. If we are going to keep the plebiscite, then there is no use talking "compromise," because our view of the matter is that a plebiscite means no independence. I think that is the view of the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL].

I have here an amendment which would permit this matter to be thrashed out in conference, and I think a sufficient number of Senators would agree to it. If we could reach a

compromise, it would be that we would eliminate the plebiscite and reach a compromise on a 10-year basis. That would be two years or five years longer than I think it should be. If there is no use in talking "compromise" with the other side, however, we might as well stand where we are.

Mr. ASHURST. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] was adopted.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation that exists here has prevented the consideration of the amendment that was intended to be offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING], which I think it is well known has been on the desk, because the amendment as a substitute would be in the third degree. Therefore we had to vote on the Broussard amendment first.

The Broussard amendment was carried by 2 votes. It will carry again, probably, by 2 votes if those who voted for it were actuated in that course by opposition to the plebiscite, because I will say that that is one of the essential parts of the Senate bill, and we might as well admit it. It is adhered to very strongly by a number of Senators.

As I understand, it was the theory of President Taft, of President McKinley, of President Theodore Roosevelt that the Filipinos should be given an opportunity for training in government, and that then they should not be cast out on the world like an old shoe. We thought it was to our interest that that should be done, but that they should themselves decide, when they decided on independence, and even the degree of independence they desired. They have reached the stage where they can determine that question, and therefore the plebiscite provision was put in the bill, because it is something which a great many hang to closely.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Does not submitting the constitution to a vote of the people amount to a plebiscite or referendum?

Mr. PITTMAN. It is a plebiscite—

Mr. BROUSSARD. Let me ask another question.

Mr. PITTMAN. Let me answer one at a time. It is a plebiscite before the screws have been put on. It is a plebiscite at the time they are allowed, if the policy of either bill is carried out, to export into this country the normal exports coming in to-day. The pressure on them will commence only when our tariff law starts to have effect against them.

There is no question but that they will adopt the constitution submitted, but the question in the minds of some is this: After they have suffered the pressure of the tariff as against their exports to our country, with no other market for their produce, whether or not that experience would not teach them that they could not economically exist for years to come without commercial relations with our country preferential against other countries. That is the test which a great many think should be put to them, and after that test they should have the plebiscite, to say whether or not they want to stay.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. When the period is fixed definitely at eight years, will they not have the opportunity of knowing what is going to happen to them?

Mr. PITTMAN. They will not; and I will explain why I say that. The period of eight years is provided in the bill which passed the House, and the Senator's amendment has adopted the House bill, because it is nothing on earth but the House bill, except for the provision of a quota of products to be admitted free of duty, and then instant freedom. During that period of time they should not suffer much, in my opinion, if at all, by reason of the fact that their exports will be free of duty after that eight years in an amount equal to what they are sending in now. But immediately after the eight years, under the bill as it passed the House, which has been adopted by the Senator's amend-



ment, they will be subject to all of the tariff laws of this country instantly, and instantly their quota of sugar, of oil, and of cordage will stop, on the morning of January 1 at the end of the eight years. And what are they going to do then? They will be subject to all of our tariff laws.

Instead of doing that to them, we would say that in the eighth year a part of our tariff shall apply, in the ninth year more shall apply, in the tenth year more, and in the eleventh year all.

They will be cut off from the benefit of the exports they enjoy for that eight years instantly under the Senator's amendment, and they will be cut off for five years under the pending bill. The Senator says they can determine, although they have never been injured, how they are going to be injured by our tariff laws. I say that they can not.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. At the expiration of the eight years our tariff laws will go into effect. Will not the Filipinos then have the privilege and right of imposing tariffs on American goods sent there?

Mr. PITTMAN. Oh, yes; they can collect some revenue out of them, just as we will be able to collect some revenue under our tariff laws. But the revenues they will be able to collect out of the goods we send to them will not take the place of their sending to us 850,000 tons of sugar and 200,000 tons of oil and the cordage they send. That little revenue will not offset those advantages. Their banks will be broke the minute we shut off their exports. Their bonds will be worthless the minute we shut off their exports, because they will have no other market for their goods, and nobody can find a market for them. I say it is cruel to say that we are going to allow them to ship goods to us here, their normal exports, for eight years and then instantly, in the eighth year, apply all of our tariff laws to them. We know that in the ninth year they will be bankrupt.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for this suggestion? During the period when our tariffs apply on a progressive ratio, are they to be allowed to collect tariffs against our goods?

Mr. PITTMAN. No.

Mr. DILL. Then the Senator proposes to have a tariff system of our country applying in ever-increasing ratio against their exports to us, but they shall have no right to collect revenues in the way of tariffs on goods coming from us.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and it would be unfair and unjust in the extreme, except for getting some of you gentlemen not to put the crusher on them at the end of eight years, and to avoid that they are willing to consent.

Mr. DILL. That is just one more proof that this plebiscite is to be used to keep the Philippines. You propose to exercise our tariffs against them over a period of years in increasing ratio; but you propose to prohibit them from using the tariff weapon against us, and, of course, that will make the condition unpopular, because they will not be able to use the power to collect tariffs against us, while we are using the power of the tariff against them.

Mr. PITTMAN. On the other hand, we find this situation existing with them: We find that these gentlemen who represent the Philippine Islands here, we find that everyone who was down there, say that, no matter when this plebiscite is taken, the overwhelming majority of those people will vote in favor of independence. They are not afraid to test the question out 10 or 12 years from now, not the slightest.

Mr. DILL. Does the Senator think it is fair to apply our tariffs in part, in a progressive ratio, and say to a new government, "You shall not have the right to put any tariffs in force against us"? Does the Senator think that is fair?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it would be absolutely inhuman except for one thing, and whether the Senator remembers that one thing or not I do not know, namely, that that is not a tariff duty against them. They impose an import duty

equal to the percentage of our tariff, and the money does not come to us but goes to pay off their own bonded indebtedness.

Mr. DILL. Then they do have a right to have a tariff. The Senator said they did not have that right.

Mr. PITTMAN. Not a tariff; it is not a tariff against us, but they impose an export tax equal to a percentage of our tariff, and the money does not go to us. It goes to the settlement of their bonded indebtedness, into a fund, and if we do not provide that fund, under the policy of the Senate committee, but pursue the practice now advocated, of allowing them to ship into this country their chief exports, to the full amount they are shipping now, for eight years, give them no warning, give them no training, and then in the ninth year cast them off and say, "You are independent. You are subject to all the tariff laws of this country; you have thrown back on you a surplus for which you have no market"—they will go bankrupt, there will be chaos there, and if we have any moral responsibility, our Government will have to go back and help them. That is the situation you are putting this thing in in your great ambition to carry out a platform pledge. In your effort to give them freedom you are willing to give them freedom at death. That is what you are willing to do.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator another question. Why must we wait to the end of the eighth year before we apply the collection proposition which the Senator says now is so necessary? Why must we wait eight years?

Mr. PITTMAN. We do not have to.

Mr. DILL. Why should we not begin after the constitution is adopted?

Mr. PITTMAN. We can.

Mr. DILL. Then why not do that?

Mr. PITTMAN. How can we, when we can not bring that question before the Senate, when the question is upon an amendment that is not subject to amendment?

Mr. DILL. The House bill could be amended.

Mr. PITTMAN. The House bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. BROUSSARD. If this motion is withdrawn, my amendment having been adopted, any Senator could propose an amendment to modify it.

Mr. PITTMAN. One can not propose an amendment that will change the result of it, because that in effect would be another vote on the same amendment.

Mr. BROUSSARD. As I stated to the committee yesterday morning, we could begin collecting the tax after the third year and have the same provision, that those funds, those taxes collected, shall be applied to the payment of the national debt.

Mr. PITTMAN. How can we vote on that?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Let us get through with it.

Mr. PITTMAN. How can we vote on that now that we have adopted an amendment cutting everything out of the Senate committee bill with regard to any tariff?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Can you not offer to amend the bill as amended?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; we can not offer to amend, because it would involve the same provision cut out.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I would like to submit that as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator has had cut out of the bill every tariff provision. He has had cut out the provision for the export tax, the revenue from which would go into a fund to pay off the bonds. He has had that cut out of the bill by an affirmative vote, which carried in the Senate, and it can not be substituted for something so as to do the same thing over again. There is only one way to do it, and that is to reconsider the vote.

I suggest to the Senator that by unanimous consent we agree to resubmit this question to a vote, allow the amendment of the committee to be voted on, give us an opportunity to consider that, and allow a motion to be made by any Senator here that the day after the inauguration of the government the progressive tariff shall start.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Can not that be done?

Mr. PITTMAN. No; it can not be done under the parliamentary situation, or it would have been done.

Mr. DILL. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PITTMAN. It can be done by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment lying on the desk, to be offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Hawes] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Cutting] be in order to the bill as now amended.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I object.

Mr. PITTMAN. There you are!

Mr. DILL. This unanimous-consent request might be submitted, namely, that this amendment be amended by providing for a progressive arrangement of imports and exports.

Mr. PITTMAN. The trouble about you is that you will not submit it to this body to determine. You are willing to have a unanimous consent that suits your ideas, but possibly not somebody else's, and we have not been in a position where we could be by reason of the parliamentary situation.

I promise this, that if we reconsider the vote by which the Broussard amendment was agreed to, and then defeat it, and then defeat the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from New Mexico, I will move to reconsider the vote and take that up again so that we can have both votes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I want to ask the Senator a question, if he will permit me.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I wish merely to express my opinion. I have very little information on parliamentary law, but if this amendment becomes a part of this bill, would not an amendment proposing to begin to tax them after the third year progressively up to the eighth year be in order?

Mr. PITTMAN. It would not be in order, because it would be a reversal of the vote.

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; it would not be.

Mr. PITTMAN. It certainly would be. You can not do by indirection something you have already decided can not be done.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. President, I want to answer a question propounded by the Senator from Washington a few minutes ago. The plebiscite is a matter which stands all by itself and can be treated by the Senate in any way it desires. It may be included or omitted, as Senators deem proper. It is out of the House bill. But our difficulty arises from this—and I think the Senator was out of the Chamber when the matter was discussed—that the House bill contains a straight limitation. The Senate bill has both a limitation and a progressive tariff set-up.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is a straight limitation for the same period of time as provided in the House bill, so it prevents absolutely the Senate conferees from doing anything but yielding to the House on his amendment. That is the difference. It is not as to the plebiscite. It is in the joint limitation and the tariff set-up.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HAWES. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Both the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Pittman] and the Senator from Missouri have repeatedly said that it is impossible to amend the bill under the Broussard amendment to apply the tariff about which he talks. I find nothing in the amendment which it seems to me would justify that contention. The amendment simply provides that section 9 shall read that "On the 4th of July immediately following the expiration of the period of eight years," and so forth. There is nothing there forbidding a tariff to be applied. Why does the Senator say the parliamentary situation makes it impossible to apply his progressive rate of taxation or tariff under the 8-year period and makes it possible to do it under the 12-year period?

Mr. HAWES. I will try to answer the Senator. All of the members of the Committee on Territories and Insular

Affairs are in agreement on the contention that if the Broussard amendment prevails we should adopt the House bill.

Mr. DILL. That is not answering the parliamentary question.

Mr. HAWES. I do not believe it can be done. It can be done on the floor of the Senate, but it can not be done in conference. Senators have been absent from the Chamber during the discussion of the bill. There are a number of amendments that have been debated and adopted and are now in the Senate bill, very desirable amendments, some of them suggested and submitted by the ex-ambassador to Japan and others. Now here we come with a matter that only indirectly concerns the plebiscite. It does affect the policy of the plebiscite in a way, but we contend that if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana prevails, then in conference there will be nothing on that subject about which to confer.

Mr. DILL. The Senator from Missouri has just now stated the whole objection of himself and others who hold his view, namely, that if the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana remains there will be no possibility of a conference extending the period of independence beyond the eight years. That is the thing that worries the Senator and about which we are most concerned.

Mr. HAWES. I have tried to explain to the Senator. I have done it half a dozen times. It is not the matter of time. It is the theory of joint limitation and the tariff.

Mr. DILL. The Senator admitted a while ago that on the floor of the Senate we could amend the bill, and I do not know why we should not do so. I have had experience with this indefinite proposition of the independence of the Philippines to the point where, so far as I am concerned, I do not trust anybody unless he is bound by statute. I want to write into the law the definite period when our control will end. The Philippines would have been free long ago if it had not been for Democrats in another body, when the other bill was there, who refused to let us pass a bill which would have set a definite date for the beginning of independence. When the Senate has voted for a definite period to end our rule in the Philippines after they have adopted a constitution, it seems to me we have finally arrived at a place with the House of Representatives that we know independence is certain for the Philippines. Some of us at least are more concerned about that than we are about a lot of details. I believe that all of the talk about a tariff being applied before the eighth year can be worked out in this bill with this Broussard amendment without having to have a 12 or 14 year period.

I appeal to the Senator, if he wants to get legislation, to work on the theory that it is not necessary to keep the islands for half a generation and have a condition that will contribute to the plebiscite going against independence.

Mr. HAWES. What does the Senator mean by stating we are trying to hold the islands for half a century when we have just told the Senator there is a proposal here that we reduce the period of 15 years by at least 5 years?

Mr. DILL. Certainly; but the Senator knows that depends on the plebiscite.

Mr. HAWES. The Senator will find on his desk an amendment proposed by me to put the Filipinos in a position, if they want to, of levying export duties and putting a tariff on our goods, if they want to do that, too, to make up for the loss that will be occasioned by cutting down by one-half their present production of sugar. These things have all been gone into time and time again. We have spent three years in discussing them.

Mr. DILL. I appreciate the Senator's reminding me of what is on my desk. I have read the amendment. I want to say to the Senator that this legislation ought to be written with a view of actually bringing about independence. The thing so many of us object to about the plebiscite is that the conditions of the bill are such that it will encourage every kind of opposition in the Philippines to a plebiscite in favor of independence. Now that we are to levy our tariff against the Filipinos in an increasing ratio and make it



more and more burdensome for them, without any tax upon our imports into the Philippines to bring them revenue, the Senator gives an added reason why the feeling will probably run against the plebiscite.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I ask that the Chair enforce the rule, which permits no Senator to speak more than twice on the same question. I ask for the enforcement of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, with all due respect, may I say to the Senator that we are all trying to work for the same objective, the speediest possible granting of independence to the Philippines. As one of the members of the committee who sat through most of the hearings may I say that the committee tried to work out a bill with all of the factors considered giving the Filipinos their independence at the earliest possible moment. Only last night I was reading a letter of General Aguinaldo, the Filipino revolutionary leader and their idol, concerning some of the things that must be taken into consideration when the Philippines are granted their independence by this country. He dwelt at great length upon the economic factors.

May I say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] that in my judgment if we adopt a seven or eight years' straight limitation the Filipino people will not have sufficient time to work up such an economic set-up that when Filipino independence is granted to them it will permit them to carry on as a free and independent nation without grievous hardships.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not now. Let me complete my statement first.

This whole matter has been misinterpreted. We are dealing not only with the question of independence, but we have written into the bill limitations upon Filipino trade with this country without giving them any counterright to limit importations from the United States coming into that country. As a matter of simple justice that alone is so outrageous that a man would be entitled to vote against the bill because it asks for himself in a bargain a privilege which he is not ready to give to the other party.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, was not the Senator present when I suggested three days ago that we give them the same right?

Mr. TYDINGS. Nevertheless, they have no agent upon this floor. They have no representative here who can speak for them. With the blind lust of greed impelled by forces in this country who want to use the bill to further their own ends at the expense of the Filipino people, we have written into it provisions which are not fair and just to them without granting to them the same rights which we arrogate to ourselves. In view of the fact that we have done that, in view of the fact that we have voted such a provision into the bill without too serious a protest, is it too much to ask that they at least be given a decent opportunity and a reasonable length of time under progressive arrangements, or tariff arrangements as they are called, in which they can set up an independent government which will function and not bring economic chaos upon the new nation no sooner than it has started to work?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator was on the committee and agreed with those who wrote the bill that there should be a step-up. My amendment does not do anything except to affect the time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but the Senator should be accurate. Another amendment which the Senator offered would cut down the amount of trade they should have with this country beyond the limit which they now enjoy without giving them any counterright to cut down our trade.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That has nothing to do with the question now before us.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes. We can not put a man in bondage and then give him a certain length of time to free himself without giving him some sort of an opportunity and some means to cut his bonds and thus free himself.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Why is it necessary to begin at 8 or 10 years to impose the taxes? Why may we not begin to impose the taxes after a period of three years, stepping it up, and dedicating those funds to payment of the Filipino bonds?

Mr. TYDINGS. In the Philippines to-day they have no insular service, they have no diplomatic service, they have no army, they have no navy. Their money affairs are audited by a representative of the United States. We have given them only the shell of local self-government without having visited upon them the functions and the rights which go with local self-government. Does anyone think that in a period of three years this nation can take over all their own affairs, have their trade representatives throughout the earth as we have, develop an army for their own defense, develop a navy for the defense of their coast when they shall have become independent? Shall we turn them loose within so many years when they will not have the opportunity to provide means to protect their independence and maintain their honor and dignity when that time has transpired?

Who wants to say that they can in eight years build a sufficient navy to protect their shores when they become independent? Who will say that within eight years they will be able to build an army to protect themselves in case their territory is invaded or their honor affected? Who wants to say that within the space of eight years they can put such trade representatives around the world as will permit them to find a market for their goods which now come to this country because we have forced upon them a free-trade basis?

Why, Mr. President, it is asinine to say that in seven or eight years the Philippines can assume all of the functions of an independent nation, because I have only mentioned a few, and there are myriad functions which they have never had to perform because we have performed those functions for the people of the Philippine Islands. What is the use of granting them independence if that independence is not strong enough to permit them to be the success which we say we want them to be? Should not we err upon the side of giving them too much time rather than to limit the time and bring down upon them the wreckage of their own government?

I am going to ask in all seriousness that Senators review the situation, consider the fact that not only will our tariff operate against the importation of Filipino goods after seven years under the Broussard amendment, but that overnight they are forced to find a market for their goods, most of which now come to this country, and which, after the 7-year period will be kept out of this country through tariff barriers. They have an army to provide; they have a navy to provide; they have a diplomatic and consular service to set up; they have to find means of taxation to support themselves and this new development which will be thrust overnight upon them. They have a new constitution to write. They have to shake down the new government and have it working smoothly. I say a period of seven years to set up their economic structure and get it working in all these ramifications and then a period of five years, with increasing tariff restrictions, is none too much for this nation, about whom there is so much question in the first place as to their ability to govern themselves. We say in one breath that they are not able to govern themselves and in the next breath we force them to govern themselves in seven years from this good hour. It is absolutely preposterous, it is utterly inconsistent to question their ability to govern themselves and then force self-government upon them in no time at all.

I venture to predict that if this 7-year period be adopted, there are many Senators who are now Members of this body

who within the next seven years will rue the day when they forced the Philippine government to take over all the functions which we now perform for it, to make itself economically sufficient and sufficiently strong to defend itself against outside attack, all within the period of eight years. It takes three years in our own country to construct a battleship.

May I point out that the Philippines have a larger population than have most of the countries of South America, except Brazil, which has a population of about 40,000,000? There are only about 10,000,000 people living in the Argentine; there are only about four or five million living in Bolivia, Peru, and Chile. Here is a nation of 13,000,000 people, with no army, with no navy, with no trade representatives around the world, with no fiscal system calculated to support and sustain all the governmental activities which we have been performing for them. It is said that within seven years they can do all this. This nation which but a few days ago it was stated was not capable of local self-government at all overnight becomes able to do things which we in our own country could not do any too well within that space of time.

I beg Senators to go back over this situation; to consider what is at stake. There may be trouble in the Orient, because the new Philippine nation will not have time forsooth to set up such military and naval establishments and such trade contacts as we want set up before we turn them loose. This proposition is too far-reaching in its ultimate ramifications to be decided in a few moments. The fate of the world may be wrapped up—world peace in the East may be wrapped up—in this bill. So I hope that the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW] to reconsider may be adopted and that we may then vote down the Broussard amendment, give these people sufficient time within which to set up a government that will last, and not have the problem dumped back again in our laps before the 7-year period is up, with all the incalculable harm which will be done in the meantime by too hasty and inconsiderate thought about the welfare not only of ourselves but of the 13,000,000 people who have no representatives in this body, but who are, nevertheless, entitled to fair play at our hands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW].

Mr. DILL. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Dale	Kendrick	Schall
Bailey	Davis	Keyes	Schuyler
Bankhead	Dickinson	King	Shipstead
Barkley	Dill	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Fess	Logan	Smoot
Black	Frazier	Long	Stelwer
Blaine	George	McGill	Swanson
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Glenn	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Byrnes	Grammer	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Nye	Walcott
Carey	Hastings	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Cohen	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Coolidge	Hawes	Pittman	Watson
Copeland	Hayden	Reed	White
Costigan	Howell	Reynolds	
Couzens	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are necessarily absent in attendance upon the funeral of the late Representative Garrett, of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is upon agreeing to—

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in view of the statement which has just been made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], which I think was absolutely justified, that this bill fails to provide a method by which the Filipinos can

tear down tariff walls while we are constantly raising them against them, and in view of the peculiar snarl we find ourselves in with regard to the plebiscite and the time limit, and the desire that many of us here have to put this bill in such shape that it may be passed, I think we should give the committee and some others of us an opportunity to discuss the measure more calmly. I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow morning at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That being a privileged motion, the question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, what is the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has moved that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, one moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Is it permissible for me to request the Senator to give his reason for the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order upon such a motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think it would be very disastrous to vote on the pending question and create further confusion in this Chamber this evening. I myself am not prepared to vote on it. After hearing the speech of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who spoke for almost an hour, many new matters came to my mind. I am not prepared to vote on the question to-night. I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senate, after having listened to a very lusty argument for three days and having expressed itself, should now in this hasty manner vote on the pending motion and not take time for further study of the many new matters that have been injected for consideration. It would be the height of folly to undertake to thresh them out here on the floor of the Senate. It is a very serious matter whether we are going to tear down the tariff walls or raise them again; whether there shall or shall not be a plebiscite; and whether the plebiscite shall be held at the end of the waiting period or before the waiting period. We might as well realize, with the Senate divided 50-50, with the House bill different in its philosophy, that it is going to be impossible to work this bill out here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I do not say that we should recommit the bill. The Senate committee, however, changed its mind within five hours last night. How do we know but that it might change its mind in two or three hours more to-night on this matter? To some extent the Senate committee last night changed its mind as to when the plebiscite should be held. I think we ought to give the Senate committee another night, and I am going to see that the Senate committee shall have another night to go over this bill.

Mr. President, if I should speak beyond the time I intend to occupy the floor, and some other Senator should feel inclined to ask me to yield in order to move a recess until to-morrow, I would certainly yield and not undertake to impose myself further on the Senate.

STUDY OF BATTLEFIELDS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR COMMEMORATIVE PURPOSES (S. DOC. NO. 151)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. REED. Since the Senator does not seem to be averse to the consumption of a little time, I thought he might allow me to consume a moment or two in making a request.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it has been the custom of the Senate to print as a Senate document all reports which have been submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of War during the progress of the study being made of our



battlefields. I have such a report, which was just received from the President and has been referred to the Military Affairs Committee, and in accordance with the usual practice I ask that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be entered.

#### CLOSING OF BARBER SHOPS ONE DAY IN SEVEN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4023) providing for the closing of barber shops one day in every seven in the District of Columbia, which was, on page 2, line 12, to strike out "empower" and insert "empowered."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT TRAFFIC ACTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4123) to amend the District of Columbia traffic acts, as amended, which was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "Representatives," to insert "the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas.

The motion was agreed to.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE AND PHARMACY

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask that it be read, and then I desire to say something about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 217) authorizing the President to invite the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to hold its eighth congress in the United States was read twice by its title.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. COPELAND. This organization, the military surgeons, will meet in Madrid in January. It has met in Brussels, Rome, Paris, Warsaw, London, and The Hague, and the organization now desires to come to the United States. I have spoken to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and he sees no objection to the immediate passage of this joint resolution without reference to a committee. It is simply an invitation. It costs nothing, and I think it would be a very gracious thing if we could accede to the wish of the military surgeons.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from New York to have asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I object, Mr. President, and demand the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The regular order is that the Senator from Louisiana has the floor, and the joint resolution of the Senator from New York will lie on the table.

#### PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7233) to enable the people of the Philippine Islands to adopt a constitution and form a government for the Philippine Islands, to provide for the independence of the same, and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG. I do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Louisiana that what he really wants to accomplish is a vote upon the matter to-morrow, when the committee has had more chance to consider it than it appears to have had up to the present time. May I suggest to the Senator from Louisiana that if he will let the pending motion be voted upon, then there would be offered an amendment which would fix the time limit at 7 years, 5 years, and 1 year. If that amendment is pending before the Senate, as I understand, it would be in order to strike out the word "seven" and insert the word "four," or to strike out the word "five" and insert the word "three"; and with the Hawes-Cutting amendment before the Senate, if the Senate saw fit to compress the time, they could do it without destroying the philosophy of the bill.

Mr. LONG. We may reach that view, but at this time the opponents of it have the upper hand. Some of our men have gone. They will outvote us this evening. They can not outvote us to-morrow morning.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Meantime, may the Chair inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if he yields to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I will yield to the Senator, but the regular order has been demanded, and I do not want to lose the floor. I ask the Chair to keep the Senator within the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will protect the rights of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BULKLEY. If the Senator from Louisiana can not yield to me to make a few remarks on another subject, I suggest to him that he yield the floor, and then I shall be glad to ask for recognition to make those remarks on the other subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That requires some cooperation from the Chair.

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir. I do not know the Chair's mind. The Chair has already advised me once that he would protect my rights, and I do not want to depend upon further advice.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir; I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Louisiana intend to permit a vote between now and the time of recessing?

Mr. LONG. No, sir; I do not. I should like to have the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Austin	Dale	Kendrick	Schall
Bailey	Davis	Keyes	Schuyler
Bankhead	Dickinson	King	Shipstead
Barkley	Dill	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Fess	Logan	Smoot
Black	Frazier	Long	Steiwer
Blaine	George	McGill	Swanson
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Glenn	McNary	Townsend
Bulkley	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Moses	Tydings
Byrnes	Grammer	Neely	Vandenberg
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Nye	Walcott
Carey	Hastings	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Cohen	Hatfield	Patterson	Walsh, Mont.
Coolidge	Hawes	Pittman	Watson
Copeland	Hayden	Reed	White
Costigan	Howell	Reynolds	
Couzens	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] are necessarily detained in attendance on the funeral of the late Representative Garrett.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

#### RECESS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 15, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

*Executive nomination received by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of December 8), 1932*

##### SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Roy D. Chapin, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Commerce, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Robert P. Lamont, resigned.

#### CONFIRMATION

*Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of December 8), 1932*

##### SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Roy D. Chapin to be Secretary of Commerce.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, because Thou art above all, because Thou art love, because Thou art near, we humbly wait upon Thy holy will. Wilt Thou be pleased to give wisdom, understanding, and godly strength to all who seek them? We pray for Thy richest blessing upon all lawful and patriotic agencies that make for righteousness, that take up the causes of the poor and lowly. Help all those who are seeking a way of comfort and happiness for those who deserve emancipation from the ills of poverty. Almighty God, our peace is touched with pain to-day. Another loyal servant of the Republic has left us. The solemn pace moves on unafrighted to the welcome land, where summer sings and never dies. Holy Comforter, hover near, hover gently to those whose lives He guarded and whose hearts He blest. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 11, 1932:

H. R. 10600. An act to exempt from the quota husbands of American citizens.

On December 13, 1932:

H. R. 1778. An act for the relief of John S. Shaw; and

H. J. Res. 503. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of December salaries of officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Capitol, police, etc., on the 20th day of that month.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

##### Senate Resolution 304

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DANIEL E. GARRETT, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

*Resolved*, That a committee of nine Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

*Resolved*, That the secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives, and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian to-morrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the foregoing resolutions the Vice President had appointed Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. BRATTON, Mr. SCHALL, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. REYNOLDS members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

#### IDE EARLY

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### House Resolution 313

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Ide Early, son of William Early, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to six months' compensation and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray funeral expenses of the said William Early.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ROANOKE COLONY COMMISSION

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### House Concurrent Resolution 42

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That section 6 of the House Concurrent Resolution establishing the United States Roanoke Colony Commission, Seventy-second Congress, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That the commission shall, on or before the 15th day of January, 1933, make a report to the Congress in order that enabling legislation may be enacted."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman why there is need of this extension?

Mr. WARREN. It has been impossible to hold a full meeting of the commission during the short time we have been here. The report is now in process of being prepared, and will be prepared probably in about a week.

Mr. SNELL. And there is no extra expense involved, or anything except the inability of getting the committee together?

Mr. WARREN. Nor has the commission itself spent over \$200.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, submitted in accordance with Public Resolution No. 38, Seventy-second Congress, authorizing a survey to be made as to the existing